NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME IV.---NO. 49. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 205.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At 143, Nassau Street, New-York.

DAVID LEE CHILD, Editor.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department: "A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

MR. VAN BUREN ON ANNEXATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 27th 1844.

MY DEAR SIR:—Under the belief that it is the right of every free citizen, in a free goverament, to know the opinions of those who aspire to public station, upon great public questions, as one of your warmest supporters in 1836 and 1840, and as an unpledged delegate to the Baltimore convention, I desire particularly to know your opinions as to the constitutionality and expediency of immediately annexing Texas to the United States, so soon as the consent of Texas may be had to such annexation.

The letters of Mr. Webster, and General Jackson, on the subject—the refusal of the legislature of Kentucky to pass approbatory resolutions—the votes taken in the legislatures of Pennsylvania, New-York, and, as I am just informed, Maine—and the impression that Mr. Clay will oppose the annexation—give great importance to your opinions.

It is believed that a full and frank declaration from you, favorable to this great object, will be of great service to the cause, at a moment so critical of its destiny; and should you recognize my right to inquire, and your duty to answer, I shall be greatly obliged to you for a letter setting forth your opinions—promising that, if it be favorable to annexation, I will, on account of the great effect it must have on the issue of this question, give to it early publicity; and if otherwise, that I will publish it only in time that your opinions may be fully known before the action of the Baltimore convention; unless you require its immediate publication—in which event I will also comply with your request.

Pardon me for suggesting that, should your opinions be favorable to annexation, the weight and influence of those opinions would be doubly enhanced in the estimation of all true friends of the measure, by the earliest possible public avowal of them before the country.

I am, sir, with great respect,
Truly you friend and ob't serv't,
W. H. HAMMET.

Hon. M. VAN BUREN,
Lindenwald, New-York.

LINDENWALD, April 20, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR:—Your letter of the 27th of March last, was duly received.

Acting as an unpledged democrat to the Baltimore convention, you ask my opinion in regard to the constitutionality and expediency of an immediate annexation of Texas to the United States, or as soon as the assent of Texas may be had to such annexation. Upon the receipt of your letter, I caused you to be forthwith informed that your request should be complied with in full season for the convention. This promise I shall now perform. But lest my motives in making a public avowal of my opinions, while a negotiation is supposed to be pending, should be misconstrued, I shall send this to a friend, who will delay its delivery as long as can be done consistently with a faithful compliance with the requirements of your letter, and the general objects for which it was written.

You by no means overrate the importance of the subject upon which you have been pleased to address me. It is not only a question of intense interest to every part of the country, but it is, unhappily, also one in regard to which we may not promise ourselves that unanimity in opinions which is so important when great national questions like this are to be decided. That those which I am about to express will, in at least one important particular, differ from that of many friends, political and personal, whose judgments and purity of views I hold in high and habitual respect, I can well imagine; and it is quite evident, from the tenor of your letter, that they will not, in all respects, correspond with your own. If, however, such of my fellow-citizens as are neither influenced by prejudices, nor warped by self-interest, concede to my opinions the merit of having been formed under views directed to the preservation and advancement of the honor and best interests of our common country, as a whole, and expressed with a sincerity which has overlooked, as far as our feeble natures will permit us to do, all personal considerations, my most favorable anticipations will be realized.

It has already been made my duty to act officially on at least two several occasions, but in different forms, upon the subject-matter to which your questions have reference.

Having charge of the department of State in 1829, I prepared, by direction of the President, instructions to our minister at Mexico, by which he was directed to open, without delay, a negotiation with the Mexican government, for the purchase of the greater part of the then province of Texas, and by which he was likewise authorized to insert in the treaty a provision similar to that in the Louisiana and Florida treaties, for the incorporation of the inhabitants of Texas into the Union, as soon as it could be done consistently with the principles of the federal Constitution. The reasons in favor of this measure, I stated at large in that document.

In taking this step, the administration of President Jackson renewed, (but, as we supposed, under more favorable circumstances,) an attempt to accomplish the same object which had been made by its immediate predecessor. Instructions, similar in their general object, had, in the second year of the latter administration, been sent from the department of State to the same American minister at Mexico. I am not aware that there were any material differences between them, other than that those of 1827 proposed an acquisition of territory as far west as the Rio Del Norte—being, I believe, the extreme western boundary of Texas—while the cession asked for by President Jackson, extended only as far west as the centre of the Desert, or Grand Prairie, which lies east of the river Nueces—and that, for the former, the payment of one million of dollars was authorized, while, by the administration of President Jackson, the American minister was permitted to go as high as four, and, if indispensable, five millions. Both authorized agreements for smaller portions of territory, and the payments were modified accordingly. In respect to the proposed stipulation for the ultimate incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union, both instructions were identical.

In August, 1837, a proposition was received at the department of State, from the Texan minister at Washington, proposing a negotiation for the annexation of Texas to the United States. This was the first time the question of the annexation of a foreign independent state had ever been presented to this government. In deciding upon the disposition that ought to be made of it, I did not find it necessary to consider the question of constitutional power, nor the manner in which the object should be accomplished, if deemed expedient and proper. Both these points were therefore, in terms, passed over, in the reply of the Secretary of State to the Texan minister, as subjects, the consideration of which has not been entered upon by the executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional power—is now presented by your inquiries; not, however, in precisely the same form. Then the application was for the immediate admission of Texas into the Union as an independent State; your question looks only to its annexation as part of the territory of the United States. There is no express power given to any department of the government to purchase territory, except for the objects specified in the Constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c.; but the power has, on several very important occasions, been regarded as embraced in the treaty-making power; and territories have been so annexed with a view, and under engagements for their ultimate admission into the Union as States. If there be nothing in the situation, or condition of the territory of Texas, which would render its admission hereafter into the Union as a new State improper, I cannot perceive any objection, on constitutional grounds, to its annexation as a territory. In speaking of the right to admit new States, I must, of course, be understood as referring to the power of Congress. The executive and Senate may, as I have already observed, by the exercise of the treaty-making power, acquire territory; but new States can only be admitted by Congress; and the sole authority over the subject, which is given to it by the Constitution, is contained in the following provision, viz: "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." The only restrictions imposed upon this general power are, 1st: That no new States shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor, 2dly, "Any State formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures concerned, as well as of Congress"—restrictions which have no bearing upon the present question. The matter, therefore, stands as it would do if the Constitution said, "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union," without addition or restriction. That these words, taken by themselves, are broad enough to authorize the admission of the territory of Texas, cannot, I think, be well doubted; nor do I perceive upon what principle we can set up limitations to a power so unqualifiedly recognized by the Constitution in the plain simple words I have quoted, and with which no other provision of that instrument conflicts in the slightest degree. But if, with no other guides than our own discretion, we assume limitations upon a power so general, we are at least bound to give them some intelligible and definite character. The most natural, and indeed the only one of that nature which has been suggested, and which was presented by Mr. Jefferson, while he entertained doubts in respect to the constitutional power to admit Louisiana, is, that the new States to be admitted must be formed out of territory, not foreign, but which constituted a part of the United States, at the declaration of independence, or the adoption of the Constitution. So far from there being any thing in the language of the Constitution, or to be found in the extraneous and cotemporaneous circumstances which preceded and attended its adoption, to show that such was the intention of its framers, they are, in my judgment, all strongly the other way. In the first place, the articles of confederation, under which the Union was originally formed, and which gave place to the present Constitution, looked directly to a broader extension of the confederacy.

It contained a provision that "Canada acceding to the confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this Union; but no OTHER COLONY shall be admitted into the same, *unless* such admission be agreed to by nine States." The practicability, as well as expediency, of making Canada a member of the Union, did certainly, to some extent at least, occupy the minds of our public men, as well before the close of the revolution, as between that event and the formation of the new Constitution. This is, however, only a link in the chain of evidence to make probable what consequent events make certain, that the framers of the Constitution had their eyes upon this very question, when this section was finally settled. That part of the Constitution, as appears by the journal of the proceedings of the convention, was presented in a variety of forms before it assumed the shape in which it was finally adopted.

In the resolutions offered by Mr. Edmund Randolph, as a basis for the new Constitution, and which contained the first propositions of that character which were submitted to it, the power in question was described as follows, viz: "That provision ought to be made for the admission of States *lawfully arising within the limits of the United States*, whether arising from a voluntary junction of government or otherwise, with the consent of a number of voices in the legislature, less than the whole." In Mr. Charles Pinckney's draft, it was proposed that the "legislature shall have power to admit new States into the Union, on the same terms with the original States, provided two-thirds of the members present in both Houses agree"—leaving out the clause in respect to the character of the territory. Mr. Randolph's proposition, containing the restriction confining the power to States *lawfully arising within the limits of the United States*, was at one time adopted in committee of the whole, and, in that state referred, with others, to the committee on detail. In a draft of a Constitution, reported by that committee, the article upon this subject contained the following propositions: 1st. That new States, lawfully constituted, or established *within the limits of the United States*, might be admitted by the legislature in this government. 2d. That to such admission, the consent of two-thirds of the members present in each House should be necessary. 3d. That if a new State should arise within the limits of any of the present States, the consent of the legislature of such States should also be necessary to its admission. 4th. That if the admission was consented to, the new States should be admitted on the same terms with the original States; and 5th. That the legislature might make conditions with the new States concerning the public debt then subsisting. The 3d, 4th, and 5th clauses, were stricken out by the votes of the convention; and after that had been done, the following was adopted as a substitute for the whole, viz: "New States may be admitted by the legislature into the Union; but no new State shall be erected within the limits of any of the present States, without the consent of the legislature of such State, as well as of the general legislature"—leaving out that part of the first clause which related to the domestic character of the territory; and this substitute was subsequently revised and amended, so as to make it conform in its phraseology, to the section as it now stands in the Constitution. These proceedings show that the proposition to restrict the power to admit new States to the territory within the original limits of the United States, was distinctly before the convention, once adopted by it, and finally rejected, in favor of a clause making the power, in this respect, general. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the propriety of referring to extraneous matter to influence the construction of the Constitution where its language is explicit, there can certainly be no objections to a resort to such aids to test the correctness of inferences, having no other basis than supposed improbabilities. I have not, therefore, been able to bring my mind to any other satisfactory conclusion than that it was the intention of the convention to give the power of admitting new States to Congress, with no other limitations than those which are specified in that instrument. The language employed, the specifications of certain restrictions, the adoption, and subsequent exclusion of that which is now referred to, together with the subsequent and continued action of the new government, all seem to combine to render this interpretation of the Constitution the true one. Propositions for annexation can certainly be imagined, of a character so unwise and improvident as to strike the minds of all with repugnance. But if we look over the conceded powers of Congress, we shall also find many others, the abuse of which might involve, to an equally great extent, the well-being of the republic, and against which abuse the Constitution has provided no other safeguards than the responsibilities to their constituents and to the laws of the land, of those whose sanction is necessary to the validity of an act of Congress. Nor is it very unreasonable to suppose that those who based their government upon the great principle, that it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new ones, in such forms as they may think most likely to effect their safety and happiness, should feel themselves secure in trusting to their representatives in the House, in the Senate, and in the executive chair, the right to admit new members into the confederacy, with no other restrictions than those which they have thought proper to specify.

It was under this view of the Constitution, that the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, only fifteen years after the adoption of the Constitution, promising the incorporation of the ceded territory into the Union, and the admission, as soon as possible, of the inhabitants to the enjoyments of the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, was ratified, confirmed, and finally executed by every branch of the federal government whose co-operation is required by the Constitution. It is true that Mr. Jefferson, in the interval between the negotiation and submission of the treaty to the Senate, threw out the opinion that the Constitution had made no provision for our holding foreign territory, nor for incorporating foreign States into the Union. The fact of his approving the treaty, and the laws necessary to its execution, must, however, be regarded as conclusive proof that, upon looking farther into the matter, his opinion was changed. The attempt to convince him of his error, was made by his friend Governor Nicholas, as appears by Mr. Jefferson's letter to him; and I have little doubt that, if his letters to Breckenridge and Nicholas had been published in his lifetime, or his attention been in any other way directed to their contents, he would, from his habitual care in such matters, have avowed the change, and explained the grounds on which it was based. It is equally true, that the acceptance of the cession, as well as the admission of the State, became party questions, and were contested with partisan warmth. Of the vital importance of that great acquisition to the safety, prosperity, and honor of the whole Union, there can, however, now be no diversity of opinion. But the councils of the nation, in the course of time, ceased to be at all divided upon the question of constitutional power to accept a cession of foreign territory, with a view to its ultimate admission into the Union. In 1819, the Spanish treaty for the cession of East and West Florida, containing the usual stipulation for ultimate incorporation into the Union, was ratified; and, upon the call of the names of the senators present, it appeared that every one voted for the ratification. Upon the question of constitutional power, so far as that case went, the Senate of the United States had, therefore, become unanimous.

Certainly no remarks are necessary to show, that there can be no possible difference produced in the constitutional question, by the relative positions of the territory comprising Louisiana, the Floridas, and Texas, in respect to the old United States.

I have gone thus fully and minutely into this matter, as well from a deep sense of the vast importance of the question, as from a sincere desire to satisfy those of my friends who may differ from me on this point, and whose opinions I hold in the highest respect, that I have not yielded my assent hastily, or unadvisedly, to the views I have here taken of the subject.

Having thus given you my views upon the constitutional question, I will, with the same frankness, answer the remaining portion of your inquiries, viz: the expediency of immediately annexing Texas to the United States, or so soon as her consent to such annexation may be obtained.

I have already referred to an application for the accomplishment of the same object that was made to this government by Texas, while I was President. The history of the Texan revolution, and the then condition of that republic, as well as the probable advantages to result to both from the proposed annexation, were placed before us in an elaborate and able communication. It can scarcely be necessary to say that the application was considered with that attention and care which were due to so grave a proposition, and under the full influence of feelings of sincere solicitude for the prosperity and permanent welfare of a young and neighboring State, whose independence we had been the first to acknowledge: feelings which constitute, and, as I sincerely hope, ever will constitute, the prevailing sentiment of the people of the United States. In coming to the decision which it became my duty to make, I was aided, in addition to the other members of my cabinet, by the counsel and constitutional advice of two distinguished citizens of your own section of the Union, of the first order of intellect, great experience in public affairs, and whose devotion to their own, as well as every other section of the Union, was above all question. The result of our united opinions was announced to the Texan minister, (General Hunt,) in a communication from the late Mr. Forsyth, the substance of which I cannot better express than by incorporating one or two brief extracts from it in this letter. Upon the general subject, my own views, as well as those of my cabinet, were thus stated:

> So long as Texas shall remain at war, while the United States are at peace with her adversary, the proposition of the Texan minister plenipotentiary necessarily involves the question of war with that adversary. The United States are bound to Mexico by a treaty of amity and commerce, which will be scrupulously observed on their part so long as it can be reasonably hoped that Mexico will perform her duties, and respect our rights under it. The United States might justly be suspected of a disregard of the friendly purposes of the compact, if the overture of General Hunt were to be even reserved for future consideration, as this would imply a disposition on our part to espouse the quarrel of Texas with Mexico—a disposition wholly at variance with the spirit of the treaty, with the uniform policy and the obvious welfare of the United States.
>
> The inducements, mentioned by General Hunt for the United States to annex Texas to their territory, are duly appreciated; but, powerful and weighty as certainly they are, they are light when opposed in the scale of reason to treaty obligations, and respect for that integrity of character by which the United States have sought to distinguish themselves since the establishment of their right to claim a place in the great family of nations.

The intimation in General Hunt's letter, that Texas might be induced to extend commercial advantages to other nations, to the prejudice of the United States, was thus noticed:

> It is presumed, however, that the motives by which Texas has been governed in making this overture, will have equal force in impelling her to preserve, as an independent power, the most liberal commercial relations with the United States. Such a disposition will be cheerfully met, in a corresponding spirit, by this government. If the answer which the undersigned has been directed to give to the proposition of General Hunt, should unfortunately work such a change in the sentiments of that government as to induce an attempt to extend commercial relations elsewhere, upon terms prejudicial to the United States, this government will be consoled by the rectitude of its intentions, and a certainty that, although the hazard of transient losses may be incurred by a rigid adherence to just principles, no lasting prosperity can be secured when they are disregarded.

That these views were not altogether satisfactory to General Hunt, nor probably to his government, has been seen. But I think I may safely say that seldom, if ever, has the decision, by this government, of a question of equal magnitude, been more decidedly or more unanimously approved by the people of the United States. The correspondence was, very soon after it took place, communicated to Congress, and although the public mind was at the time in a state of the highest excitement, and the administration daily assailed through every avenue by which it was deemed approachable, I am yet to see the first sentence of complaint upon that point, in any quarter of the Union. Even a resolution offered in the Senate, declaring annexation, "whenever it could be effected *consistently with the public faith and treaty stipulations of the United States*, desirable," was ordered to be laid upon the table; and a similar disposition was made in the House of the papers upon the subject, which had been referred to the committee on foreign relations, and that committee discharged from the farther consideration of the matter, upon its own application. Nor were the friendly relations then existing between that republic and the United States—to its honor be it said—in any perceptible degree impaired by this decision.

Standing in this position before the country it becomes my duty to consider whether either the nature of the question or the circumstances of the case, have so far changed as to justify me in now advising a policy from which I then, in the most solemn form, dissented.

In giving to you, and through you to the public, the results of a very careful and dispassionate examination of this grave question, I should neither do justice to yourself, to the patriotic State which you, in conjunction with others, are to represent in the convention, to the people of the United States, nor to my own position, if I failed to accompany it with a brief exposition of the grounds upon which I have proceeded. It is in that way only that justice can be done to my intentions; and that is all I desire. The annexation of the territory, and the consequent assumption by us of a responsibility to protect and defend its inhabitants, would in respect to the consideration to which I am about to refer, stand upon the same footing with that of its admission as a State. The recognition of Texas as an independent State was a measure which received, in various and appropriate forms, the sanction of every department of the government, whose co-operation was necessary to its validity, and had my hearty concurrence. From this act of our government, just and proper in all respects as it was, an inference has, however, been drawn, and brought to bear upon the present question, not only very far beyond its real bearing, but by which its true character is entirely reversed. Many persons who enter upon the consideration of the subject with the purest intentions, and are incapable of knowingly giving a false interpretation to anything connected with it, take it for granted that the United States, in recognizing the independence of Texas, declared to the world, not only that she was independent *in fact*, but also that she was such *of right*. Acting upon this erroneous construction, they very naturally conclude that, having gone thus far, having examined into and passed not only upon the existence of her independence, but also upon her right to its enjoyment, it is now (and more especially after the lapse of several years) too late to hesitate upon the question of annexation on the ground of any existing controversy upon those points. The fallacy of this reasoning will be apparent when it is considered that the usage of nations to acknowledge the government, *de facto*, of every country, was established for the express purpose of avoiding all inquiry into, or the expression of any opinion upon, the question of *right* between the contending parties. They acknowledge no other power in any country than that which is in fact supreme. They cannot inquire beyond that point without interfering with the internal concerns of other nations—a practice which all disclaim, and a disclaimer which it has been our invariable usage not only to make, but to enforce with scrupulous fidelity. To recognize the independence of the government *de facto*, is also a matter of state necessity; for without it, neither commercial nor diplomatic intercourse between any such power and the nations of the world could be carried on with success, and the social interests of mankind require that these should not be arrested by quarrels between contesting parties, in regard to their respective right to the supreme power. In respect to all beyond this, the laws and usages of nations require the observance of a strict neutrality between the contending parties, as long as the war lasts. It is due, also, from every government to its own citizens, to declare when a revolted colony shall be regarded as an independent nation.—Because, "it belongs to the government alone to make the declaration;" and because, "until it is made, or the parent State relinquishes her claims, courts of justice must consider the ancient State of things as remaining unaltered, and the sovereign power of the parent State over that colony as still subsisting." But nothing can be farther from giving to the act of recognition its true character, than to suppose that it has the slightest bearing upon the rights of the parties; it being, as I have already said, resorted to for the express purpose of avoiding any such construction. Such is not only the law and usage of nations, but such also have been the reiterated avowals of our own government. I do not remember that the recognition of Texan independence gave rise to any correspondence between Mexico and our govenment; and if it did, I have not the means of stating its character. But the principles upon which all such acts are based were fully set forth by this government upon the occasion of the recognition of the independence of the Spanish American States. In the message of President Monroe, to the House of Representatives, suggesting the propriety of that recognition, it was expressly declared that, in proposing this measure, it was "not contemplated to change thereby, in the slightest manner, our friendly relations with either of the parties; but to observe in all respects, as heretofore, should the war be continued, the most perfect neutrality between them." The committee on foreign affairs, in their elaborate report upon the subject, say; "Our recognition must necessarily be coexistent only with the fact on which it is founded, and cannot survive it. While the nations of South America are actually independent, it is simply to speak the truth to acknowledge them to be so. *Should Spain, contrary to her avowed principle and acknowledged interest renew the war for the conquest of South America, we shall indeed, regret it; but we shall observe, as we have done between the independent parties, an honest and impartial neutrality.*" The Secretary of State, in defense of the act of recognition, said to the Spanish minister. "This recognition is neither intended to invalidate any right of Spain, *nor to affect the employment of any means which she may yet be disposed or enabled to use, with the view of reuniting those provinces to the rest of her dominions.*" That these avowals were in strict conformity to the true principles of the law of nations there can be no doubt. They were, at all events, those which this government has solemnly announced as its rule of action in regard to contests between rival parties for the supreme power in foreign States. That the admission of Texas as a member of this confederacy, while the contest for the maintenance of the independence she had acquired was still pending, and a consequent assumption of the responsibility of protecting her against invasion, would have been a plain departure from the laws and usages of nations, and a violation of the principles to which we had avowed our adherence in the face of the world, was too clear to be doubted. Thus believing, I had on the occasion to which I have referred, in the faithful discharge of the trust which the people had reposed in me, but one course to pursue; and that was promptly but respectfully adopted.

I return now to the question. Has the condition of the contest between Texas and Mexico, for the sovereignty of the former, so far changed as to render these principles now inapplicable? What is the attitude which these two States at this moment occupy toward each other? Are they at war, or are they not? We cannot evade this question if we would. To enumerate all the circumstances bearing upon it, in a communication like this, would be impracticable, nor is it necessary. In respect to the parties themselves, there would seem to be no misunderstanding upon the subject. Mexico has been incessant in her avowals, as well to our government as to others, of the continuance of the war, and of her determination to prosecute it. How does Texas regard her position in respect to the war with Mexico? Three years subsequent to our recognition of her independence, we find her entering into a stipulation with a foreign power to accept of her mediation to bring about a cession of hostilities between her and Mexico, engaging to assume a million sterling of the debt due from Mexico, to the subjects of that power, if she, through her influence, obtained from Mexico an unlimited truce in respect to the war then raging between her and Texas within one month, and a treaty of peace in six. As late as last June, we see a proclamation of the President of Texas, declaring a suspension of hostilities between the two powers during the pendency of negotiations to be entered upon between them, issued on the supposition that a similar proclamation would be issued by Mexico; and actual hostilities are now only suspended by an armistice, to be continued for a specified and short period, for the sake of negotiation. Nor are our views upon the point less explicit. In the published letter of the late Secretary of State, to the Mexican minister at Washington, written in December last, he says: "Nearly eight years have elapsed since Texas declared her independence. During all that time Mexico has asserted her right of jurisdiction and dominion over that country, and has endeavored to enforce it by arms." In the President's message to Congress, it is stated, "That the war which has existed for so long a time between Mexico and Texas has, since the battle of San Jacinto, consisted for the most part of predatory incursions, which, while they have been attended with much of suffering to individuals, and kept the borders of the two countries in a state of constant alarm, *have failed to approach to any definite result.* And after commenting with much truth upon the insufficiency of the armaments which Mexico has fitted out for the subjection of Texas—on the length of time which has elapsed since the latter declared her independence—on the perseverence, notwithstanding, in plans of reconquest by Mexico—on her refusal to acknowledge the independence of Texas, and on the evils of border warfare, the message adds: "The United States have an immediate interest in seeing an end put to the state of hostilities between Mexico and Texas;" following up the remark with a forcible remonstrance against the continuance of the war, and a very just and impressive statement of the reasons why it should cease. This remonstrance is, in my opinion, entirely just, and perfectly proper. The government of the United States should be at all times ready to interpose its good offices to bring about a speedy, and, as far as practicable, a satisfactory adjustment of this long pending controversy. Its whole influence should be exerted, constantly, zealously, and in good faith, to advance so desirable an object, and in the process of time it can, without doubt, be accomplished. But what, my dear sir, is the true and undisguised character of the remedy for these evils, which would be applied by the "immediate annexation of Texas to the United States?" Is it more or less than saying to Mexico, "We feel ourselves aggrieved by the continuance of this war between you and Texas; we have an interest in seeing it terminated; we will accomplish that object by taking the disputed territory to ourselves; we will make Texas a part of the United States, so that those plans, of reconquest, which we know you are maturing, to be successful, must be made so against the power that we can bring into the contest; if the war is to be continued, as we understand to be your design, the United States are henceforth to be regarded as one of the belligerents?"

We must look at this matter as it really stands. We shall act under the eye of an intelligent, observing world; and the affair cannot be made to wear a different aspect from what it deserves, if even we had the disposition (which we have not) to throw over it disguises of any kind. We should consider whether there is any way in which the peace of this country can be preserved, should an immediate annexation take place, save one—and that is, according to present appearances, the improbable event that Mexico will be deterred from the further prosecution of the war by the apprehension of our power. How does that matter stand? She has caused us to be informed, both at Mexico and here, in a manner the most formal and solemn, that she will feel herself constrained, by every consideration that can influence the conduct of a nation, to regard the fact of annexation as an act of war on the part of the United States, and that she will, notwithstanding, prosecute her attempts to regain Texas, regardless of consequences. Exceptions, are, however, taken by the President, and I think very justly taken, to the manner in which this determination has been announced. The Mexican government should certainly have applied in a becoming spirit to our's for explanations of its intention. If it found this government under the impression that Mexico, although it might not be willing to acknowledge its independence, had abandoned all serious hope of reconquering Texas, Mexico should have assured us of our error, and remonstrating against any action on our part based on that erroneous assumption, declared firmly, if it pleased, but in that courteous and respectful manner which is alone suited to the intercourse between nations who profess to be friends, its determination to oppose us. Instead of taking a course, the propriety of which was so obvious, she first assumes, upon grounds which were neither proper nor safe for her to act upon, that this government had designs upon Texas; then denounces the annexation as a great national crime, and forthwith proclaims instant war, as the penalty of our persisting in such an attempt; and all this in language bearing certainly, (although subsequently disavowed,) every appearance of menace.

But this is a besetting and very ancient foible of the mother country, as well as of her descendants, in their diplomatic intercourse. Every one conversant with the subject of Spanish relations knows that, at least from the time of Don Luis de Onis, to the present day, this government has been frequently—not to say continually—subjected to this species of diplomatic dogmatism. Partly in consequence of the genius of their language; partly from their peculiar temperament; much from habit, but more from a radical defect of judgment—they continue the use of language in their State papers, which better tempered if not wiser diplomatists have almost everywhere laid aside as worse than useless. But at no time has our government suffered its action upon great national questions to be influenced by such petulance. From the time of the modest, yet firm Madison, to the late Mr. Upshur, (whose melancholy fate is so justly and generally lamented,) has every Secretary of State, acting under the direction of the executive, deemed it sufficient to place the government and minister employing it in the wrong, by showing its injustice as well as its futility. We have then, heretofore, as I hope we shall now, decided to act in the matter under consideration in a manner which was deemed due to justice and to our own character, without being in any degree influenced by such unavailing menaces. It is foreign to my habit, and repugnant to my feelings, to say anything that should offend the pride of any nation, if the declarations of individuals could possibly have that effect, being sincerely desirous that the United States should cultivate friendly relations with all. But with a population not equal to half that of the United States, and laboring under many and serious disadvantages, from which we are comparatively free, Mexico could not, with propriety, be offended by the assumption that this government may act as it would have done, had no such menace been made, without the slightest danger of being regarded by the rest of the world as having been intimidated by threats of war from that republic. So at least I should act, if the direction of public affairs were in my hands. The question then recurs, if, as sensible men, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the immediate annexation of Texas would, in all human probability, draw after it a war with Mexico, can it be expedient to attempt it? Of the consequences of such a war, the character it might be made to assume, the entanglements with other nations which the position of a belligerent almost unavoidably draws after it, and the undoubted injuries which might be inflicted upon each, notwithstanding the great disparity of their respective forces, I will not say a word. God forbid that an American citizen should ever count the cost of an appeal to what is appropriately denominated the last resort of nations, whenever that resort becomes necessary either for the safety, or to vindicate the honor of his country.

There is, I trust, not one so base as not to regard himself, and all he has, to be forever and at all times subject to such a requisition. But would a war with Mexico, brought on under such circumstances, be a contest of that character? Could we hope to stand perfectly justified in the eyes of mankind for entering into it; more especially if its commencement is to be preceded by the appropriation to our own uses of the territory, the sovereignty of which is in dispute between two nations, one of which we are to join in the struggle? This, sir, is a matter of the very gravest import—one in respect to which no American statesman or citizen can possibly be indifferent. We have a character among the nations of the earth to maintain. All our public functionaries, as well those who advocate this measure, as those who oppose it, however much they may differ as to its effects, will, I am sure, be equally solicitous for the performance of this first of duties. It has hitherto been our pride and our boast, that, while the lust of power, with fraud and violence in its train, has led other and differently constituted governments to aggression and conquest, our movements in these respects have always been regulated by reason and justice. A disposition to detract from our pretensions in this respect, will, in the nature of things, be always prevalent elsewhere; and has, at this very moment, and for special causes, assumed, in some quarters, the most rabid character. Should not every one, then, who sincerely loves his country—who venerates its time-honored and glorious institutions—who dwells with pride and delight on associations connected with our rise, progress, and present condition—on the steady step with which we have advanced to our present eminence, in despite of the hostility, and in contempt of the bitter revilings of the enemies of freedom in all parts of the globe—consider, and that deeply, whether we would not, by the immediate annexation of Texas, place a weapon in the hands of those who now look upon us and our institutions with distrustful and envious eyes, that would do us more real, lasting injury, as a nation, than the acquisition of such territory, valuable as it undoubtedly is, could could possibly repair? It is said, and truly said, that this war between Texas and Mexico has already been of too long duration. We are, and must continue to be, more or less annoyed by its prosecution, and have undoubtedly, as has been remarked, an interest in seeing it terminated. But can we appeal to any principle in the law of nations, to which we practise a scrupulous adherence, that would, under present circumstances, justify us in interfering for its suppression in a manner that would unavoidably make us a party to its further prosecution? Can this position be made sufficiently clear to justify us in committing the peace and honor of the country to its support?

In regard to the performance by us of that duty, so difficult for any government to perform—the observance of an honest neutrality between nations at war, we can now look through our whole career, since our first admission into the family of nations, not only without a blush, but with feelings of honest pride and satisfaction. The way was opened by President Washington himself, under circumstances of the most difficult character, and at no less a hazard than that of exposing ourselves to plausible, yet unjust, imputations of infidelity to treaty stipulations. The path he trod with such unfaltering steps, and which led to such beneficial results, has hitherto been pursued with unvarying fidelity by every one of his successors of whom it becomes me to speak.

If our sympathies could induce a departure from a policy which has so much in its commencement to consecrate it, and such advantages to recommend its continuance, they would doubtless draw us to the side of Texas. That the happiness of her people would be promoted by the maintenance of her independence, I have no doubt. Few, if any, efforts for the extension of the blessings of free government, in any part of the world, have been made since the establishment of our own independence, that have failed to excite our earnest and sincere wishes for their success. But they have never been permitted to withdraw us from the faithful performance of our duty as a neutral nation. They were excited, and deeply, too, at the commencement of the French revolution; they were revived in the struggle of the South American States for the establishment of their independence; they have been put to their severest trial in this very contest between Texas and Mexico. Yet, in that whole period of time, amidst the convulsions of empires, and the lawlessness of power by which many of its possessors have been distinguished, it has been a cardinal point in the administration of the affairs of this republic to adhere with the strictest fidelity to the rule which was laid down by Washington, enforced by Jefferson, and respected, with unabated sincerity, by their successors.

There is another circumstance which is well calculated to mislead us upon this subject. Many, if not most, of the persons to be affected by the decision of this question, were once citizens of the United States, and have still their relatives and friends among us. I am not unaware of the hazard to which I expose my standing with the latter, in speaking thus unreservedly upon a point so well calculated to excite deep feelings. This is perhaps more particularly applicable to that portion of my fellow-citizens, of whom it was aptly and appropriately said by one of their own number, that "they are the children of the sun, and partake of its warmth." Yet, whether we stand or fall in the estimation of our countrymen, it is always true wisdom, as well as true morality, to hold fast to the truth. It is, moreover, a consolation to know that if to nourish enthusiasm is one of the effects of a genial climate, it at the same time seldom fails to give birth to a chivalrous spirit, which will not permit itself to be outdone in the extent or sincerity of its sacrifices at the shrine of patriotism. To preserve our national escutcheon untarnished has, consequently, if reliance can be placed upon our public archives, been an object of unceasing solicitude with southern statesmen.

Nothing is either more true or more extensively known, than that Texas was wrested from Mexico, and her independence established, through the instrumentality of citizens of the United States. Equally true is it that this was done not only against the wishes, but in direct contravention of the best efforts of our government to prevent our citizens from engaging in the enterprise. Efforts have, nevertheless, not been wanting on the part of those who are not over-anxious for the credit of republican governments, to misrepresent the views of ours in this respect—to cause it to be believed that our efforts to prevent unlawful participation by our citizens in that struggle were insincere; that we coveted this portion of the territory of Mexico; and having failed to obtain it by fair purchase, or by negotiation, we saw in this movement a preliminary step, which would in the end, be equally subservient to our views upon Texas. No one can have had better opportunities of knowing how unfounded these injurious imputations were than myself. As early as when President Houston first went to Texas, I believe in 1829, I was consulted by General Jackson upon the subject of a private letter addressed by him to the honorable Mr. Fulton, now Senator of the United States, then secretary of the territory of Arkansas, requesting him to cause the movements of General Houston to be watched, and to apprise the President of the first indication on his part of an intention to violate the laws of the United States by an armed incursion into Mexico. From that period to the end of General Jackson's term of office, I am as well satisfied as I can be of any fact, that he was sincerely desirous to perform his whole duty as chief magistrate of the country, and to prevent, in this respect, the slightest violation of the laws, with the execution of which he was charged. He no doubt, sincerely believed that the incorporation of Texas into the federal Union would be alike advantageous to her, to Mexico, and to the United States; and was ever ready to adopt all proper measures for the accomplishment of that object. But they know very little of General Jackson's true character, who can for a moment permit themselves to believe him capable of doing, countenancing, or advising, a single act which he believed, or had even reason to apprehend, would violate the plighted faith of his country, or infringe upon the duty which it owes to the great family of nations. To prevent our people from going to Texas, and embarking in the war, was an impossibility which neither he nor any other chief magistrate could have accomplished. If they went there without military organization, or armaments, and chose to place themselves beyond the protection of this government, we had no right to control their action; nor do other governments exercise any such right in similar cases. For the suppression of military enterprises, organized and armed here against a nation with which we are at peace, the provisions of our laws are ample. But of the difficulties of enforcing them with a frontier and a seaboard like those which open our communication with Texas, no sensible and well-informed mind can be ignorant.

For the voluntary action of our government in regard to the subject of annexation, we can have no such explanation to give. The acquisition of so valuable a territory, by means which are of questionable propriety, would be a departure from those just principles upon which this government has ever acted, and which have excited the admiration and secured the respect of the dispassionate and enlightened friends of freedom throughout the world. But I am very sure that we shall all, in the end so act upon this subject as to put it out of the power of the natural enemies of republican institutions to make any plausible charge of infidelity to our avowed principles in respect to it. No one was more deeply sensible of the necessity of the greatest prudence in this particular, or more anxious to secure its observance, than General Jackson. As late as December, 1836—only a few months before the recognition—he thus expresses himself, in a special message to the Senate: "But there are circumstances in the relations of the two countries which require us to act, on this occasion, with even more than our wonted caution. Texas was once claimed as a part of our property; and there are those among our citizens who, always reluctant to abandon that claim, cannot but regard

with solicitude the prospect of the reunion of the territory to this country; a large portion of its civilized inhabitants are emigrants from the United States, speak the same language with ourselves, cherish the same principles, political and religious, and are bound to many of our citizens by ties of friendship and kindred blood; and more than all, it is known that the people of that country have instituted the same form of government with our own, and have since the close of your last session, openly resolved, on the acknowledgment by us of their independence, to seek admission into the Union as one of the federal States. This last circumstance is a matter of peculiar delicacy, and forces upon us considerations of the gravest character. The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence. She asks us to acknowledge that title to the territory, with an avowed design to treat immediately for its transfer to the United States. It becomes us to beware of a too early movement, as it might subject us, however unjustly, to the imputation of seeking to establish the claims of our neighbors to a territory, with a view to its subsequent acquisition by ourselves."

It has been urged, from a quarter entitled to great respect, and reasoned, too, with no inconsiderable degree of cogency, that the acquisition of Texas now, in the mode proposed, would be liable to no greater objection than the accomplishment of the same object would have been either in 1827 or 1829, when it was attempted by two successive administrations to purchase it from Mexico. If I were to go into a discussion of this question, and the facts necessarily connected with it, I should be writing a book instead of a letter; nor is it necessary that I should. I will therefore content myself with saying, that with every disposition to look at the subject in all its bearings with an impartial eye, I have not been able to see the analogy which is claimed to exist between the two cases. But if it were even admitted that the able men who were, at those respective periods, at the head of the government, under strong convictions of the importance of the acquisition of Texas to the United States, so far precipitated their measures for the accomplishment of that object, as to have endangered the good faith and pacific relations of the United States, (which I do not admit,) we could still only felicitate ourselves on their failure, but could not thereby justify the present movement, if it is not right in itself, and capable of justification on other grounds. I by no means contend that a formal recognition of the independence of Texas by Mexico is necessary to justify us in assenting to her annexation to the United States. Time and circumstances may work such a change in the relations between those two countries as to render an act of that character, on the part of Mexico, unnecessary and unimportant. What I mean to say is, that from all the information I have been able to acquire upon the subject, no change has yet taken place in those relations that would make the objections, which I have here detailed, inapplicable.

It is said, also, that if Texas is not acquired now, the opportunity will be forever lost—that some other power will acquire it; and, indeed, some of the rumors of the day have gone so far as to say that the Texan minister is already instructed, in case of failure here, to proceed forthwith to Europe with full authority for the accomplishment of that object. We must not forget, that besides great public considerations, there are extensive private interests involved in this matter; and we may therefore well be distrustful of the thousand rumors which are from day to day put afloat upon this subject. What a comparatively few individuals, acting under the influence of personal interest, may not desire to have done, I will not undertake to say, or to conjecture. But that the people of Texas—so many of whom carry in their veins the blood of our revolutionary ancestors—thousands of whom are thoroughly imbued with democratic principles—who achieved by their own gallantry that independence which we were the first to acknowledge—who have established and subsequently maintained institutions similar to our own—that such a people, and such a government, will ever be found capable of sending a minister to the crowned heads of Europe, to barter away their young and enterprising republic, and all that they have purchased with their blood, to the highest bidder, is what I cannot believe; in the possibility of "so apostate and unnatural a connection" I can have no faith.

It is also apprehended by many, that the British authorities will attempt to make Texas a British colony or dependency. I find it difficult to credit the existence of such infatuation on the part of any European power. I cannot bring myself to believe that any European government, which has not already made up its mind to provoke a war with this country, will ever attempt to colonize Texas, either in form or in substance. If there be any such power the considerations to which I have adverted would soon lose most of their importance; for opportunities would not then be slow in presenting themselves for the conquest of whatever territory might, in that event be deemed necessary to our security in legitimate self-defense. Commercial favors, Texas has, to the same extent as other independent powers, the right to dispose of as she thinks proper: subject only to the penalties which are certain, sooner or later to follow in the wake of national injustice. But European colonization of Texas is another and a very different matter—a matter in respect to the ultimate consequences of which no European nation can possibly deceive either herself or us. I have no access to the sources of true information in respect to the degree of credit which may be due to these rumors; but our government ought, without doubt, to exercise a most jealous vigilance against the extension of British influence, and indeed foreign influence or dominion of any kind, or from any quarter, either in Texas, or in any of the portions of the continent bordering on the Gulf of Mexico.

If the time ever comes when the question resolves itself into whether Texas shall become a British dependency or colony, or a constitutional portion of this Union, the great principle of self-defense, applicable as well to nations as to individuals, would without doubt, produce as great a unanimity among us in favor of the latter alternative, as can ever be expected on any great question of foreign or domestic policy.

Having now replied, in the fullest and frankest manner, to both the questions which you have propounded to me, I might here close this letter; but being sincerely anxious to put you, and others occupying the same position, in possession of my views and opinions upon the whole subject, as far as they can with propriety be now formed and expressed, I will go a few steps farther.

Occasions do sometimes present themselves, in the administration of public affairs, when the decision of great questions can be safely anticipated by those whose subsequent duty it may become to pass upon them; but to justify such a course, those questions must be such as are unavoidably dependent upon circumstances and considerations of a fixed and settled character. I have not been able to regard this as being, in all its aspects, a case of that description. It is a matter affecting our foreign relations, in respect to which every enlightened nation makes it a rule to avoid, as far as practicable, public announciations of its proceedings and intentions beyond what is deemed necessary either to justify its past course, or to make others sensible of its determination to resist aggression, whether present or prospective. As the action of the executive upon all questions that affect our relations with other countries must be more or less influenced by their conduct toward us, it is, in general, desirable that his future course should not be embarrassed by assurances given at a period when no safe opinion could be formed of what that conduct would be. In respect even to motives of a domestic character, it could scarcely be deemed consistent with that prudence and calm discretion which, in public as well as private affairs, is of such estimable value, to bind ourselves in advance in respect to the particular line of conduct we will hereafter adopt in a case of such magnitude as the present. When the period for definitive action shall have arrived, the considerations now taken into view may have lost the weight they at present possess in the estimation of the public; and others, not now regarded as of any value, may, in the meantime, arise to affect materially, if not to change, the whole aspect of the subject. The present condition of the relations between Mexico and Texas may soon be so far changed as to weaken, and perhaps to obviate entirely, the objections against the immediate annexation of the latter to the United States, which I have here set forth, and to place the question on different grounds. Should such a state of things arise, and I be found in charge of the responsible duties of President, you may be assured that I would meet the question, if then presented to me, with a sincere desire to promote the result which I believed best calculated to advance the permanent welfare of the whole country. In the discharge of this, the common duty of all our public functionaries, I would not allow myself to be influenced by local or sectional feeling. I am not, I need hardly say to you, an untried man in respect to my disposition or ability to disregard any feeling of that character in the discharge of official duties. You, as well as others, have therefore at least some grounds on which to form an opinion as to the probable fidelity with which these assurances would be observed.

I shall add a few words on another aspect of the question, and then dismiss the subject. Mexico may carry her resistance in refusing to acknowledge the independence of Texas, and in destructive but fruitless efforts to re-conquer that State, so far as to produce, in connection with other circumstances, a decided conviction on the part of a majority of the people of the United States, that the permanent welfare, if not absolute safety of all, make it necessary that the proposed annexation should be effected, be the consequences what they may. The question may be asked, what, under such circumstances, would be the use you would make of the executive power, if intrusted to your hands? Would it be wielded to defeat or to carry into effect the ascertained wishes of our people? My reply to such a supposition is, that I can conceive of no public questions in respect to which it is more eminently proper that the opinions and wishes of the people of the different States should be consulted, and being ascertained, treated with greater respect, than those which relate either to the admission of a new member into the confederacy, or the acquisition of additional territory, with a view to such a result; and that if any application for annexation under such circumstances were made to me, I would feel it to be my duty to submit the same to Congress for a public expression of their opinion, as well upon the propriety of annexation, as in regard to the terms upon which it should take place. If, after the whole subject had been brought before the country, and fully discussed, as it now will be, the Senate and House of Representatives, a large portion of the former, and the whole of the latter having been chosen by the people, after the question of annexation had been brought before the country for its mature consideration, should express an opinion in favor of annexation, I would hold it to be my farther duty to employ the executive power to carry into full and fair effect the wishes of a majority of the people of the existing States, thus constitutionally and solemnly expressed.

There may, notwithstanding, be those, on both sides of this great question, who are unwilling to confer their suffrages on one who is not prepared to give them specific pledges in regard to the course he would, if elected, pursue in respect to the various aspects in which this matter may hereafter be represented. To all such I have only to say—and I do so with the greatest sincerity—that I have not the slightest disposition to question their right so to regulate their conduct, and will be the last to complain of its exercise. If there be any one who they believe can be more safely intrusted with their interest in this or any other of the great questions of public policy which are likely to arise in the administration of the government, or whose assurances as to his future course are more satisfactory to them, they will, without doubt, be well warranted in giving him the preference, and they may be assured that no one will more cheerfully acquiesce in a decision, made from such motives, than myself. I have expressed a willingness to discharge to the best of my abilities, the responsible duties of the high office in question, should the democracy of the United States be able and willing to re-elect me to the same. But I can take no steps to obtain it by which my ability to discharge its duties impartially and usefully to every portion of our common country would be impaired; nor can I, in any extremity, be induced to cast a shade over the motives of my past life by changes or concealments of opinions maturely formed upon a great national question, for the unworthy purpose of increasing my chances for political promotion.

I am sir, very respectfully,
Your friend and obedient servant,
M. VAN BUREN.

Hon. W. H. HAMMET.

From the Globe of April 30.

LETTER FROM SENATOR BENTON.

To the members of the Texan Congress, in answer to their communication to him expressing the wish of Texas to be admitted into the American Union.

WASHINGTON CITY, April 30, 1844.

GENTLEMEN: I have seen in the newspapers the published copy of your communication to me, intended for the information of the American Congress, and expressing the desire of Texas to be admitted into the American Union, and shall take pleasure in using the original, whenever it shall arrive, according to your wishes. I say when it shall arrive; for this original has not yet come to my hands; and, therefore, cannot now be communicated to Congress; and the copy being published during my brief absence from the city, I feel myself laid under the necessity of giving a public answer to your letter, in order to avoid the appearance of a disrespectful inattention to your request.

You have judged rightly, gentlemen, in addressing your communication to me, and proposing to make me the organ of your wishes to the American Congress, being, as I am, the first opponent of the treaty which dismembered your territory from our Union; the first advocate for its recovery; the supporter of all prudent measures for that purpose; the enemy of all movements which would involve the question in sectional or partisan politics; and the firm believer in the speedy and happy recovery of the dismembered territory, and the mutilated rivers, if the question could be kept free from improper connections, and confined to the patriotic basis of nationality and honor.

I was a member of the bar in St. Louis, in the then territory of Missouri, in the year 1818, when the newspapers announced the progress of the treaty, which was signed in the February following, and which threw away Texas, dismembered the valley of the Mississippi, mutilated two of our noblest rivers, brought a foreign boundary to the neighborhood of New Orleans, and established a desert barrier between Missouri and Mexico to interrupt their trade, and shelter the depredators upon the lives and property of their citizens. I was not then in politics, and had nothing to do with public affairs; but I saw and felt at once the whole enormity of this gratuitous and unaccountable sacrifice, and instantly raised my voice against it in articles published in the St. Louis papers, and in which were given, in advance, all the *national* reasons against throwing away the country, which are now, after a lapse of twenty-five years, given by others for getting it back. I was young and ardent then, and had some fire in me, and not only wrote against the treaty, but against its authors, and their motives; and even imprecated a *woe* upon the heads of the statesmen who should continue to favor it.* Mr. Adams, the negotiator and the ostensible author of the treaty, was the statesman against whom all my censure was directed, and I was certainly sincere in my then belief of his great culpability; but the declaration which he has lately made on the floor of the House of Representatives absolves him from all censure on account of that treaty, and places the blame on the majority of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, by whose votes he was governed, contrary to his own opinions, in establishing the boundary which I so much condemned.

The voice of a mere individual, not in any public station, and a thousand miles from the seat of government, was no impediment to the progress of the treaty: it went forward; was signed in the month of February, 1819; approved by Mr. Monroe's cabinet; unanimously ratified by the Senate; and greeted with the universal applause of the public press.

But all this concurrence of authorities, and of applause, made no impression upon me. I continued to look upon the treaty with indignation and amazement; and the more so, because the published correspondence showed that the sacrifice of our territory was gratuitous and wanton! that the Spanish government had offered us more than we had accepted! that we had voluntarily sacrificed our rivers, boundaries, and territory! and I continued to assail the treaty under the confident belief that such an unnatural boundary could not stand, and that the sacrificed territory would eventually be restored to the country from which it had been torn.

The treaty of 1819, between the United States and Spain, so far as it applied to the southwestern boundary of the United States, was one of the most gratuitous sacrifices ever made by a nation which was not conquered, and actually occupied by a conquering army. It gave up a natural boundary—a great river, a desert, and a mountain—on the most vulnerable flank of the Union—the flank coterminous with the largest foreign power on our continent, and proximate to one of our greatest and most exposed cities. Instead of this natural boundary, far removed from our cities and population, it substituted an arbitrary line under a longitude far in the interior of our country, and along rivers wholly within our natural boundaries, and incapable of being fortified except at an expense of hundreds of millions. It gave up 300,000 square miles of territory, enough to make up five or six great States, and all of it not only valuable in itself, but valuable beyond all price, from its position within our natural limits. It brought a foreign frontier—*the frontier of a non-slaveholding empire*—to the neighborhood of New Orleans, and almost to the heart of the valley of the Mississippi. It mutilated two of our great rivers—the Arkansas and the Red river—streams equal to the Danube, and both of which had their sources and their mouths within our natural boundaries, and were wholly ours by existing treaties; placed a foreign power upon their banks, and gave that power a right, *according to our own assertion of the law of nations*—a right to navigate those rivers through our territories to their outlet in the sea. It gave away not only the southern and sunny province of Texas, but what never was Texas, but a part of the valley of the Mississippi, lying between the Red river and Arkansas, and extending to the hyperborean region of north latitude 42. Finally, it established a desert region of great extent between the State of Missouri and the Province of New Mexico, to interrupt and mar the inland commerce, and the social intercourse, between the United States and the Mexicans on the important line of communication between St. Louis and Santa Fé; and to crown all these sacrifices of territory, rivers, and natural boundaries, they were made in favor of a *non-slaveholding* power, whose dominions were thus brought in contact with the slaveholding State of Louisiana, and almost in contact with the slaveholding (then territories, now) States of Missouri and Arkansas.

Such a sacrifice of great national interest, so unanimously concurred in by the public authorities, gave the first great shock to my confidence in public bodies: the treaty of the next year with the British government for the joint occupation of the Oregon, gave me the second great shock, and the two shocks together, *shock* me so much that I came into public life, in 1820, with very little concern for my own position, when I should chance to find myself standing "*solitary and alone*," upon great national questions.

I came to the Senate of the United States in the fall of 1820, the recovery of Texas being a leading object in my mind; and the more so, because Missouri was the greatest sufferer by its loss. During Mr. Monroe's administration, nothing could be done toward this recovery; for it was the same President and cabinet which had just thrown away the country. In the commencement of Mr. Adams's administration, Mr. Clay being Secretary of State, the first attempt was made to recover what had been lost, and I gave a faithful support to the effort, by writing articles in the newspapers to sustain and promote it. This effort was unsuccessful. General Jackson's administration made the same attempt, and with the same result; and I need not repeat that I gave it a cordial support. In the second term of General Jackson's administration the revolt of Texas took place, (1838,) and several gentlemen of the South were immediately in favor of availing ourselves of that event to recover possession of the lost territory. Recognition of Texan independence, and admission of Texas into the Union, (and this before Texas applied for admission,) were urged by them as simultaneous acts—twin operations—to be accomplished together. I could not agree to it. Mexico and Texas were at war; and to admit Texas into our Union, was to go to war with Mexico, with the faith of treaties, and the opinion of the world against us. I could not go for admission: recognition was the furthest that I could venture; and that with some misgiving, at so early a stage of the contest, for fear of the effect it might have on our commerce with Mexico.

The next year, (1837,) being the first of Mr. Van Buren's administration, a Texan minister, (General Memucan Hunt,) arrived here to solicit the admission of his country into our Union. He did me the honor to speak to me on the subject, counting largely upon my co-operation, from the well-known detestation which I had expressed for the treaty which gave Texas away. But I told him from the beginning that it was impossible: that, much as I desired the restoration of Texas, my first duties were to my own country; that Mexico and Texas being at war, I could not jeopard the peace of the United States, compromise its honor in the eyes of nations, and injure its commerce, by taking a step which should give Mexico a right to treat us as an enemy. Mr. Van Buren's administration gave the same answer; and all America approved it.

Thus, while being incontestibly the first opponent to the loss of Texas, and the first advocate for its recovery, I have yet already twice found it impossible to support propositions for its admission into our Union; and that I may do justice to my own conduct—may show that I am not a blind zealot, rushing headlong to a favorite object—but a man of head and thought, considering what he is about, and striking a balance between the good and the evil of an important proposition—that I may do this, I will here present an extract from my speech in the Senate of the United States, on Friday, July 1st, 1836, on the resolution for the acknowledgment of the independence of Texas, and in which my policy, and that of the administration, was faithfully sketched:

Mr. Benton rose, and said he should confine himself strictly to the proposition presented in the resolution, and should not complicate the abstract question of recognition with speculations on the future fate of Texas. Such speculations could have no good effect upon either of the countries represented—upon Mexico, Texas, or the United States. Texas has not asked for admission into this Union. Her independence is still contested by Mexico. Her boundaries, and other important points in her political condition, are not yet adjusted. To discuss the question of her admission into this Union, under these circumstances, is to treat her with disrespect, to embroil ourselves with Mexico, to compromise the disinterestedness of our motives in the eyes of Europe, and to start among ourselves, prematurely, and without reason, a question which, whenever it comes, cannot be without its own intrinsic difficulties and perplexities.

* * * * * *

The conduct of the administration has been strictly neutral; and, as a friend to that administration, and from my own convictions, I have conformed to its policy, avoiding the language which would irritate, and opposing the acts that might interrupt pacific and commercial communications. Mexico is our nearest neighbor, dividing with us the continent of North America, and possessing the elements of a great power. Our boundaries are coterminous for more than two thousand miles. We have inland and maritime commerce. She has mines; we have ships. General considerations impose upon each power the duties of reciprocal friendship; especial inducements invite us to uninterrupted commercial intercourse. As a western senator, coming from the banks of the Mississippi, and from the State of Missouri, I cannot be blind to the consequences of interrupting that double line of inland and maritime commerce, which, stretching to the mines of Mexico, brings back the perennial supply of solid money which enriches the interior, and enables New Orleans to purchase the vast accumulation of agricultural produce of which she is the emporium. Wonderful are the workings of commerce, and more apt to find out its own proper channels by its own operations, than to be guided into them by the hand of legislation. New Orleans now is what the Havana once was—the entrepot of the Mexican trade, and the recipient of its mineral wealth. The superficial reader of commercial statistics would say that Mexico but slightly encourages our domestic industry—that she takes nothing from our agriculture, and but little from our manufactures. On the contrary, the close observer would see a very different picture. He would see the products of our soil passing to all the countries of Europe, exchanging into fine fabrics, and these returning in the ships of many nations, our own predominant, to the city of New Orleans, and thence going off in small Mexican vessels to Matamoras, Tampico, Vera Cruz, and other Mexican ports.

The return from these ports is in the precious metals; and, to confine myself to a single year, as a sample of the whole, it may be stated that, of the ten millions and three quarters of silver coin and bullion received in the United States, according to the custom-house returns during the last year, eight millions and one quarter of it came from Mexico alone, and the mass of it through the port of New Orleans. This amount of treasure is not received for nothing; nor, as it would seem on the commercial tables, for foreign fabrics unconnected with American industry; but, in reality, for domestic productions changed into foreign fabrics, and giving double employment to the navigation of the country. New Orleans has taken the place of the Havana. It has become the entrepot of this trade; and many circumstances, not directed by law, or even known to lawgivers, have combined to produce the result. First, the application of steam power to the propulsion of vessels, which, in the form of towboats, has given to a river city a prompt and facile communication with the sea; then the advantage of full and assorted cargoes, which brings the importing vessel to a point where she delivers freight for two different empires; then the marked advantage of a return cargo, with cheap and abundant supplies, which are always found in the grand emporium of the great West; then the discriminating duties in Mexican ports in favor of Mexican vessels, which makes it advantageous to the importer to stop and tranship at New Orleans; finally, our enterprise, our police, and our free institutions—our perfect security, under just laws, for life, liberty, person, and property. These circumstances, undirected by government, and without the knowledge of government, have given to New Orleans the supreme advantage of being the entrepot of the Mexican trade, and have presented the unparalleled spectacle of the noblest valley in the world, and the richest mines in the world, sending their respective products to meet each other at the mouth of the noblest river in the world, and there to create, in lapse of time, the most wonderful city which any age or country has ever beheld.

A look upon the map of the great West, and a tolerable capacity to calculate the aggregate of geographical advantages, must impress the beholder with a vast opinion of the future greatness of New Orleans; but he will only look upon one half of the picture, unless he contemplates this new branch of trade, which is making the emporium of the Mississippi the entrepot of Mexican commerce, and the recipient of the Mexican mines; and which, though now so great, is still in its infancy. Let not government mar a consummation so auspicious in its aspect, and teeming with so many rich and precious results. Let no unnecessary collision with Mexico interrupt our commerce, turn back the streams of three hundred mines to the Havana, and give a wound to a noble city which must be felt to the head spring and source of every stream that pours its tribute into the king of floods.

From this extract it will be seen that I then viewed the Texan question, under all its aspects, and considered what was due to Mexico and the United States, as well as what I wished in relation to Texas itself. My aim was to accomplish eventual admission without a breach with Mexico—without compromising our national honor—with as little dissatisfaction as possible to any part of our own Union—and without the loss of the rich stream of gold and silver which the Mexican mines were annually pouring into New Orleans and the West. This was my wish and my effort; and putting off the question of admission, I voted for recognition, but not without serious misgivings that our known sympathy for the Texan cause, and the promptness of our acknowledgment of Texan independence, (notwithstanding the care of President Jackson and President Van Buren to observe the strictest neutrality, and to treat Mexico with all respect,) might have the effect of alienating Mexican feeling from us, and injuring the valuable trade which we carried on with the Mexican people. Events have shown that these misgivings, so strongly felt in 1836, were not without foundation. Everybody knows that New Orleans has lost the Mexican trade—that the stream of the precious metals now flows to the mouth of the Thames, which but lately flowed from Tampico and Vera Cruz to the mouth of the Mississippi. Everybody knows this, and the custom-house books prove it—those books, which show us an import of ten millions and three-quarters of specie from Mexico, at the commencement of the Texan revolution, and of one milion and a quarter for the year 1842—the last year to which the accounts have been made up.

Such has been my conduct, and the reasons for it, on the two occasions when the admission of Texas into our Union has been proposed, and when I have opposed both propositions. Now, a third proposition for admission is made, and under circumstances more formal and imposing than heretofore: it comes in the form of a treaty laid before the Senate; and what I shall do upon this treaty does not become me to say, standing as I do in an official relation to the question, and bound soon to act upon it. All that I shall say is, and I wish the discussions on the question of ratifying this treaty to be public that the nature of the question; the manner in which it has been conducted heretofore; justice to the people;—justice to individual senators; the absurdity of a secret discussion in the Senate and a public discussion in the newspapers; the indisputable fact that jobbers, speculators, and intriguers have known all along what was concealed from the people and their representatives;—all these circumstances, and the prevention of future false reports of the action of the Senate for sinister purposes, (political, speculating, and stockjobbing,) requires the action of the Senate to be public; and I shall accordingly move to open its doors upon the discussion of the treaty, when it shall be taken up.

Leaving out of view, then, the treaty which is now before the Senate, and only looking to the general question, I can say that I look to the recovery of Texas, and of our mutilated rivers and national boundaries, as inevitable facts in the natural order of human events; that they naturally belong to the valley of the Mississippi, and to the American Union, and will return to it with ease and honor if wise and temperate counsels prevail; and that this natural consummation of a coming event can only be delayed for a time by throwing the questions into our elections, perverting it from its national basis, making it sectional and partisan, prostituting it to unworthy purposes, running the question at men, and making it the means of disturbing the peace and harmony of the country.

Besides her general interest, as a member of the Union in this great question, the State of Missouri, to which I belong, has a special interest in it, which doubly recommends it to my care. Texas, as constituted by the treaty of 1819, is protracted far to the North, and interposed between Missouri and Mexico. Its northeast corner is in latitude 38—the latitude almost of St. Louis; its northwest corner is in latitude 42—the latitude of Cape Cod and Marblehead. All the northern half of Texas, thus protracted to the latitude of St. Louis and of Boston, and lying between Missouri and Mexico, is filled with treacherous savages and lawless white men, who make the merchant and his property their constant prey. Our inland trade to Mexico has to pass through this infested desert; our government cannot go there to give it protection; and, since twenty years, this trade has suffered every variety of depredation. Many worthy citizens engaged in it, have been killed; much property has been plundered; many Mexican merchants, coming to trade with us, have also been killed and robbed, and others deterred from coming; and besides these actual losses, the trade has been prevented from increasing as it otherwise would have done: and can now only be carried on as in desert and barbarous countries, by armed caravans fighting their way through a banditti of robbers and murderers. These evils result from the unfortunate treaty of 1819, and must be continued until the country dismembered from us by that treaty shall be restored to our Union.

For myself, it might be supposed that I take some pride in seeing so many marching up now to the point at which I stood "solitary and alone," twenty-five years ago; but it is not so. I am too old for that puerility, and too much a friend to popular government to rejoice in anything which is discreditable to it. A feeling of mortification, rather, oppresses me at the inconsistency, and inconsiderateness which I have witnessed. When Texas was ours, free from debt and full of land, and might have been retained without a question from abroad, without dissension at home, and without the expense of a shilling—when this was the case, we threw the virgin province, as a worthless toy, away! Now, when eviscerated of her lands, and loaded with debt—when her recovery is attended with the danger of foreign war, the certainty of domestic discontent, the loss of commerce, and the disturbance of business—when this is the case, we are all of a sudden seized with a blind and furious passion to repossess her. Immediate annexation is the word! and we cannot even wait one brief year for the ripened pear to fall of itself into our hands. This is inconsistent and discreditable, and implies levity and folly, instead of judgment and patriotism, in the conduct of our public affairs. Being a friend to popular government, and anxious for its honor and success, I regret as much to see the sudden passion of 1844, as I did to see the sluggish apathy of 1819. I wish to see Roman steadiness, and not Athenian levity, prevail in our government; and being myself a man of some temperance and stability, addicted to no paroxisms, and subject to no variations, I shall continue to advocate the recovery of our sacrificed territory, and mutilated rivers, and natural boundaries, in the same calm and considerate manner as I have for twenty-five years past.

With respect to Texas, her destiny is fixed. Of course I, who consider what I am about, always speak of Texas as constituted at the time of the treaty of 1819, and not as constituted by the republic of Texas, comprehending the capital, and forty towns and villages of New Mexico! now, and always as fully under the dominion of the republic of Mexico, as all the towns and villages of Canada are under the dominion of Great Britain! It is of this Texas—the old Spanish Texas—of which I always speak; and of her I say, her destiny is fixed! Whatever may be the fate of the present movement, her destination is to return to her natural position—that of a part of the American Union. The interest of both parties requires it; and the same feeling and policy which made the Texan people desire it for eight years past, will make them continue to desire it until the re-union is accomplished. No earthly power, except Mexico, has a right to interfere in this question; and her right must soon cease. If she is wise, she will cease hostilities at once, acknowledge your independence, and rejoice to see you return to the American Union. If she is not wise, she may keep up a constructive war for some years, without making anything by it; for nominal war, after the expiration of the present armistice, will answer no purpose. Spain refused to acknowledge the independence of Holland for seventy years after she was actually independent; that exhibition of Castilian pride and obstinacy made no difference in the rights of Holland, and in the conduct of Europe. From the time that actual war ceased, Holland was admitted by Europe to all the rights of an independent power, without regard to the nominal pretensions of Spain; and so it was with the late Spanish provinces in the new world, and so it will be with Texas and Mexico. A short time, and either the acknowledgment of Mexico, or the consent of all nations, will give Texas all the rights of a sovereign power: the question of admission will then be one of exclusive arrangement between the two countries; for no earthly power, except Mexico, has a right to interfere in this question; and, in fact, I know of no one that wishes to interfere in it. If kept free from sectional views, partisan politics, and selfish, personal and sordid schemes, the re-union may then be easily effected, and in a way that ought to be satisfactory to the whole Union, though not without a heavy expense to the federal treasury. Come when it may, the cost of recovering this dismembered limb of Louisiana may equal, or exceed, the whole cost of the original acquisition of that vast province! such is the fruit of the unaccountable treaty of 1819! But the cost *in money* will be no obstacle to my action. Costs of a different kind are what I wish to avoid; costs in national honor—in foreign war—in ruined commerce—in domestic dissention—in sectional animosities—and in the disturbance of the harmony of the Union and the business of the people. The sacrifice of Texas was a calamitous blunder in 1819: let us not repeat the blunder, and double the calamity, by the *manner* of recovering it in 1844.

Respectfully, gentlemen, your obliged friend, who will be happy to salute you as his esteemed fellow-citizens.

THOMAS H. BENTON.

To Messrs. J. A. GREEN, and others, Members of the Congress of Texas.

* The magnificent valley of the Mississippi is ours, with all its fountains, springs, and floods; and wo to the statesman that shall undertake to surrender one drop of its water—one inch of its soil—to any foreign power."—*St. Louis Enquirer*, 1818.

Communications.

SEPARATION AMONG FRIENDS.

The following communication was sent to The Friend, but that paper, refusing to publish it, we are requested to do so:

To the Editor of The Friend:

Having seen in two numbers of thy paper, of the 9th and 16th of 12th month, 1843, an article purporting to give an account of the "Recent separation in Indiana, and the causes which led thereto," written by an unknown hand, and containing various misstatements and misrepresentations, we believe it right for us to notice a few of them, with a view to disabuse the public mind in relation thereto; and we hope thou wilt have the fairness to give our article an insertion, that those who have read the anonymous statement alluded to, may have the opportunity to see what we may say in our own defense. We shall endeavor to be brief, only noticing a few of the many objectionable passages contained in the account. And in the first place, permit us to express our surprise, that any person should write out an historical account of a transaction, involving an important controversy, to go down to posterity, and withhold his name from the public; and we are more surprised that thou shouldst publish such an account, accompanied by an approbatory editorial notice, thereby taking upon thyself all the responsibility. As thou hast permitted a concealed opponent to discharge his arrows at us in the open field, we claim it as due to us to be permitted, through the same medium, to defend ourselves, or rather the cause of truth, against the false charges that have been hurled at us from the secret ambush of a hidden foe.

The writer professes to have carefully read the documents issued by anti-slavery Friends, explanatory of their reasons for separating from the old yearly meeting, and declares himself unable to perceive any cause which is adequate to justify the proceedings. Will the public, will posterity receive this as a sufficient evidence that our declaration does not show sufficient cause? The argument is simply this: An anonymous writer, an acknowledged opponent, an interested witness, declares that *he* is unable to discover any adequate cause; therefore, there is none! What may not be proved by such a process as this? Our declaration is a statement of facts, and those facts thy correspondent has passed over in silence, or noticed but slightly. Why? Undoubtedly because facts are stubborn things; and it is easier to deny than disprove. The attempts to mislead the public, by holding out the idea, that we separated because Friends did not think it right to approve and sanction certain measures to which the separatists were favorable, and which related to the anti-slavery societies, is an evidence of blind prejudice, or willful perversion. The prominent, or indeed the sole cause of our separation as set forth in our declaration, is, not that our opposers would not unite with other abolitionists in exertions for the extirpation of slavery, but because they used all their influence and power to prevent us from doing so; and censured, proscribed, and took measures to deprive us of the privileges and benefits of religious society, (measures which evidently tended to our final disownment,) because we would not be restrained from a discharge of what we conscientiously believed to be our duty. It was not because they would not unite in our views respecting the use of slave-grown produce, but because the strongest measures in their power were used to prevent us from presenting our views, and laboring for the reformation of society; and when we did so, (notwithstanding we were frequently told that in society was the place where we ought to labor,) we were treated with the most marked disrespect, as offenders against the peace and harmony of society. An illustration of this spirit of opposition to the introduction of anti-slavery into our meetings may be seen in the document under consideration. Our author says: "After the occurrence, C. Osborn, under whose eye the essay was drawn up, seldom suffered his quarterly meeting to pass, when present, without introducing an anti-slavery discourse, generally in connection with his ministry." Now this is certainly a very grave charge: that a minister of the gospel should, once in three months, "open his mouth for the dumb;" and it appears to have been a great annoyance to the "body." And there is no doubt but that the determined opposition with which C Osborn met, in his attempts to discharge his duty to the slave in the society, tended much to convince him of the error of the opposition to uniting with others in the labor; and he, as well as many others, became fully satisfied that the ostensible objections of many prominent opposers were not the real ones, when the proposition made and advocated by him, to form anti-slavery societies of Friends, was met by the same opposition as was manifested against joining mixed associations. And it is well known that the head and front of his offending, was his advocacy of Friends' anti-slavery societies; his unwillingness to join in the proscriptive measures of the opposers; his manifestations of sympathy and unity with those who had rendered themselves obnoxious to censure by their anti-slavery labor; and, as we are now informed, his habit of preaching anti-slavery doctrine, in connection with his ministry.

When we united with other abolitionists, we were told that we were in danger of compromising our principles, by mixing with those who do not agree with us in sentiment. When we proposed to form Friends' anti-slavery societies, this was pronounced to be worse, and we were told that in society, in our meetings for discipline, was the proper place for Friends to labor. When we introduced the subject there, we were treated as disturbers of the peace and harmony of society. When we labored privately, either by writing or speaking, in behalf of the anti-slavery cause, without connecting ourselves with any association, we were told that we were acting in our own wills, and in our own strength; that our testimony against slavery was *purely* a religious one, and that we should wait for the special moving of the Holy Spirit, as in the discharge of the duties of the ministerial office. And when C. Osborn made this subject one theme of his ministry, he is gravely charged as an offender, and it is brought forward as a justification of the proscriptive measures of the "body," that "he seldom suffered his quarterly meeting to pass, when he was present, without introducing an anti-slavery discourse, and generally, in connection with his ministry." Let it be remembered, that C. Osborn did not join a mixed modern anti-slavery society, and but very seldom attended their meetings. From these facts, which can be most clearly substantiated, the impartial reader will be forced to the conclusion, that the opposition was, in reality, to any action which should have a tendency to make the impression on the public mind, that Friends had any connection with, or sympathizing for "modern abolitionism," and that it was impossible for those who thought it their duty to give their influence to support the cause, to do so in any way, and remain in unity with the body.

We shall now proceed to notice a few misstatements made by thy correspondent, and leave the question at issue to be decided by the verdict of the unbiassed and impartial.

It is stated, that at the called meeting for sufferings, in third month, 1889. "C. Osborn, and H. H. Way, who were both present, were of the judgment that Friends ought not to join with those societies."

Now this, with regard to H. H. Way's judgment in the case, according to his own positive assertion, and our intimate knowledge of his sentiments, is not correct. He, in that meeting, opposed the issuing of any advice against joining anti-slavery societies, but said he should have no objection to such a course, if it could be done without injuring the anti-slavery cause; but at the same time expressed his opinion that it could not be done; and in private conversation with C. Osborn on the subject, between the adjournments of the meeting, when urging his objections, Charles replied, that perhaps we had better drop the subject, for he had much rather not issue anything, than to do the least injury to the anti-slavery cause.

Thy anonymous correspondent says, "When the essay of the epistle was produced, it was found to be of a character different from what had been proposed at the previous meeting—*faintly suggesting* that it might not be necessary for Friends to join abolition societies; and the meeting did not adopt it." Here is a most egregious misrepresentation. The idea is clearly conveyed, that the epistle was rejected because it was not sufficiently decided in its advice against joining anti-slavery societies; whereas, the principal ground of objection with our opposers, and so far as we recollect, the only one, was its strong and unequivocal condemnation of the colonization scheme. This our author has, no doubt for what appeared to him prudential reasons, kept entirely out of sight. We know that some who were favorable to the anti-slavery enterprise, as distinguished from colonization, objected to the epistle on account of its tendency to discourage Friends from joining anti-slavery societies; but we are pretty confident that no individual made the objection that is represented by thy correspondent to have been the cause of its rejection; and we think the objection of those who were in favor of joining anti-slavery societies, had very little influence in the decision of the question.

The statement about the "person from New England represented to be an anti-slavery agent," must have been intended to apply to Arnold Buffum, as no other person came from New England under that character. Now, the assertion that he sometimes preached and lectured *in Friends' meetings for divine worship*, is, we have no doubt, an absolute falsehood. It is positively denied by him, and we can find no person who has any knowledge of his ever attempting to preach or lecture in a Friends' meeting for worship, in Indiana, or anywhere else in the western country, till since the separation. We have no hesitation in saying that the statement is wholly without foundation.

In the statement of the remarks made in New Garden quarterly meeting, in eleventh month, 1842, by Benjamin Stanton, there is another egregious error. He is represented as charging them (the committee) with error, in stating that *other* yearly meetings were in unity with Indiana, in reference to the anti-slavery societies," fairly implying that he denied that there were other yearly meetings that pursued the same policy with regard to the anti-slavery societies, that Indiana did. This is altogether erroneous. He only charged them with error in stating that the practice of all the other yearly meetings, was in accordance with that of Indiana; and showed in a conclusive manner, that his charge was true, by referring to the practice of London yearly meeting, in opening its meeting-house in time, or immediately at the close of the yearly meeting, for an anti-slavery meeting, in advising its members to unite with their fellow-countrymen in the anti-slavery cause; by making large donations to the anti-slavery society, &c. &c.

In short, there is scarcely a paragraph in the whole article, free from falsehood or misrepresentation, either direct or by implication; but as we wish to be brief, we shall only notice one or two more items. Thy correspondent speaks in contemptuous language of the smallness of our numbers, as contrasted with the greatness of theirs, and we believe (though we have not numbered Israel,) that he makes the disparity greater than it is. We have never considered, however, that the multitude was always in the right way, or that the smallness of the company was proof positive of their being in the broad road to ruin.

We would inquire of the

smiled, and observed, "I do not take pay for preaching," threw down two dollars, mounted his horse, and rode off.

This volume is beautifully printed, in clear, handsome type. It is a book well calculated to interest intelligent and religious people, especially those of the Society of Friends. I. T. H.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

THE ISSUE.

There is no longer the slightest room to doubt that the great and absorbing question in the ensuing election, is the annexation of Texas. It is probable, therefore, that parties will to some extent break up, form, and serry their ranks anew. We shall not permit ourselves to prejudge the action of any party on this subject, for we desire to see all men in this great crisis seek their proper affinities and settle, whether for good or evil, into a solid, tangible, assailable or defensible form.

We have already, under the head of "Washington correspondence," given declarations of Southern members indicating an *ulterior* design of very great importance—(to themselves)—no less, indeed, than the dissolution of the Union, and the formation of a southwestern confederacy, which shall include Texas; and long ago we indicated that such was their intention. We have now had distinct and repeated calls in the *Spectator*, the Calhoun organ in this city, on the South to rally, to rely on their own strength and make this annexation to themselves whether the North and East will or no. "Texas shall be ours." "To the South it is a question of life and death." "Let her speak with a voice, which every corner of the Union shall hear, and let that voice proclaim, TEXAS SHALL BE OURS. Leave the ignoble strife of who shall be her master in a president—leave the general affairs of the confederacy, which are administered for Northern aggrandizement and power—and bend all her high energies to the great duty of self-protection and self-preservation. There is salvation for her in no power under heaven but her own, *self*-poised, and self-administered. By such a course she will be respected, *feared*, and loved. Texas may see and await *her* movements, and neither traitors in the South, nor abolitionists in the North, nor British interference or hostility shall prevail against Texas annexation. Texas or ruin are the alternatives they present to the South; shall she not meet her destiny."

If this be the spirit of the Southern leaders, and they are *sincere*, they have launched one of the most perilous enterprises that men ever undertook in the tide of time. But undoubtedly they flatter themselves that they can yet prevail by bullying and blustering. It must not therefore be supposed that they are ready to *do* the heroic, and *ruin* themselves, until they have tried the desperate chance of recovering the power to rule us. This design leaks out in the word "feared!" "She will be *feared*." The object for the present is intimidation, and nothing but that. They suppose that their threats, which will make true men only brace themselves the firmer, and set their face like a flint against these absurd demands and these paltry tricks, will terrify many Northern and Eastern *doughfaces*. But they are not aware how wonderfully that class has been reduced since the experiment upon them in the case of Missouri. We should not be surprised, if it should be soon found, that like the famous bird, called the *Dodo*, the very species is extinct.

The Globe (the Van Buren organ) differs from the Spectator, and from the administration, as to the time and manner of prosecuting the scheme, but not at all as to the object. Its interpretation of Mr. Van Buren's precious piece of machiavelism, is the same that we gave last week, on the day of its publication. The Globe says: "Mr. Clay, contrary to his speech of 1820, and his conduct when Secretary of State, under Mr. Adams, goes against annexation now or hereafter. Mr. Van Buren, in conformity with his conduct when Secretary of State, under General Jackson, goes for annexation whenever it can be accomplished without war with Mexico;" *i. e.* whenever war between Mexico and Texas actually ceases, *or* whenever the Congress of the United States shall deem it necessary, to the security of this country, with the consent of a majority of the people of the existing States, oh, oh, oh!

Again the Globe says: "Mr. Van Buren's plan is the practicable one, and the only practicable, and every real friend to the acquisition of Texas must go for it, or go against the accomplishment of his own wishes. Thus, on all accounts, we go heart and soul for Mr. Van Buren's plan."

The Globe thinks the "reasons" for the measure assigned by Mr. Calhoun, were designed to kill it; and the editor insinuates that Mr. Calhoun has "projects" of his own, independent of, and beyond "the scheme" of the administration, which render the rejection of the treaty desirable for *him*. What those projects are, the editor threatens to unfold. He thus characterizes Mr. Calhoun's reasons for annexation." These grounds are carefully calculated to shock those States, [the small non-slaveholding,] and drive them from the support of the treaty or ruin them at home if they do support it. Slavery, its extension, perpetuation, preponderance, and benefits, abstract and practical, figure in the correspondence as the great overwhelming reason for the acquisition."

The Globe, however, misrepresents Mr. Van Buren on one material point. He says that Mr. Van Buren is in favor of annexation whenever the war shall have practically ceased. Mr. Van Buren says not so; on the contrary, the case, which according to his assumption, will justify the annexation without the consent of Mexico, and at all hazards, is that of the war becoming dangerous to the welfare and safety of this country. This condition evidently supposes war to be raging, not to have "practically ceased." Mr. Van Buren speaks of no such case as that of nominal continuance, but practical cessation of the war. One thing stated by the Globe is quite remarkable, and worthy of profound attention, as being in all probability a *private* interpretation by Mr. Van Buren himself of the latter part of his public letter. It is that the contingency which, according to his doctrines, (if he can be said to have doctrines,) would justify the annexation, will happen "within the limits of one year," *i. e.* as soon as Mr. Van Buren can be placed in the presidential chair. This is too good!

Mr. Benton is also out in a long letter on the same subject. He claims to have been the first opponent of the Florida treaty, by which he says the land of Texas, and the water, were thrown away; and the first advocate of its recovery. But he is opposed to the annexation at this time. He takes, substantially, Van Buren's ground, adding, however, (and this shows through what channel the Globe got its cue,) that "in one brief year the ripened pear will fall of itself into our hands!" Say you so?

We shall see about that. After this there can be little doubt that Mr. Van Buren has explained himself privately.

The Spectator also gives up Clay as an annexationist "forever." It says: Mr. Clay has abandoned the great cause, (of annexation,) avowedly forever, for no one expects to see the day in which there will not be "a considerable and respectable portion of the confederacy" opposed to the annexation of Texas."

The great issue for the pending election is thus made up. One party is decidedly against the measure at any time; and of the two fragments of the other party, the one now in power is in favor of it now, and the other not in power is in favor of it next year, when it *hopes* to be in power, and that too by means of this very promise of perfidy and spoliation!

We shall look with interest for the Globe's development of Calhoun's "projects."

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, May 5th, 1844.

If the treaty of annnexation itself be deeply stained with fraud and perfidy, the reasons alledged in justification of it, are, if possible, still more detestable. It must be grateful to all abolitionists, to find something in our federal institutions for which we can be grateful. We are accustomed unavoidably to dwell so much upon the enormities, which they sanction, that everything redeeming ought to be peculiarly dear to us. Of this nature is the necessity, which the spirit of the Constitution and the habits of the country impose upon public men, of assigning reasons for their measures before the tribunal of the country, and of the reading and thinking men of all countries. But for this, the dismemberment of Mexico for a purpose which cries to Heaven, would have been accomplished without the inconvenience of rendering a reason. It would have been done up as the partition of Poland was by the royal and imperial robbers, in prudent silence. The measure of annexation was in fact suited to the genius of despotism. Our cabinet has not left it to inference what use they would have made of power, had they possessed it, in regard to this matter, Mr. Upshur in his despatch to our chargé in Texas, dated January 16, 1844, says:

"I have reason to suppose that the silence of the President of the United States in his annual message on the subject of annexation, has created an impression in Texas either that he is indifferent to that measure, or that he despairs of its success. Such an impression does him great injustice. It is already known to Texas that the President has used every means in his power to mitigate the horrors of war, waged by Mexico against that country. In his last message he uses the most emphatic language on that subject. He declares that it is time that the war had ceased, and this in effect announces his own purpose to put an end to it by any means, which he can constitutionally command. He has no means except such as he derives from the treaty-making power. These he now offers to exert."

This leaves no doubt how he would have employed other means, had he possessed any other. It is known that he has employed an infamous person, somewhat known to abolitionists, as his confidential agent in Mexico, a person who obtained access to numbers of the government by falsely pretending that he was a New England abolitionist, and to the church by a pretense equally false, that he was a Catholic priest. In the present strait, and perhaps still more pressing, which awaits him, there is reason to apprehend that Tyler will not limit himself to means which "he can constitutionally command." By the messenger who was despatched with the treaty of nexation to Texas, he conveyed to Houston an assurance that Texas should receive assistance from the United States, whenever the armistice should terminate, or Texas should see fit to recommence the war!! Doubtless this will seem to many, incredible; but a reference to past transactions of this government, will make it not only credible, but extremely probable. In 1836, while the Mexicans were prosecuting with vigor and success the war against the insurgents, and the lawless and unrestrained intruders and marauders from the United States, the then President ordered General Gaines to pass the frontier. He did so, and General Houston ordered out a body of militia to reinforce the troops of the United States. In fact, our army acted, to all intents, as the ally of Texas, so that Mexican prisoners were in doubt whether they were prisoners to the Texans, or the Americans! General Gaines has been ordered to the scene of his former operations, and should Mexico resume the war, he will probably put himself at the head of the allied army of the United States and Texas, and thus involve us in a war, about which the war-making power has not been consulted. That a repetition of an aggression so unprincipled and daring, will be followed by an instant declaration of war by Mexico, is as certain as any future event, depending on human will, can be. Mexico now has a stable and vigorous government, domestic tranquillity, and a well-disciplined army of 25,000 men. Besides this, it would be in their power by issuing letters of marque and privateer commissions to adventurers of all nations, to wage an exterminating war upon our commerce, without possessing any herself, which could be the subject of reprisals. The discontented, needy, and rapacious of all countries, finding no congenial employment in the almost universal peace now prevailing, would pounce like hungry vultures upon their prey. It is even probable that Texans themselves, and perhaps some in our own cities, would take Mexican commissions, and prey upon our commerce. Not a vessel, richly laden, would depart from, or for our harbors, without her invoice being communicated to privateers, and vessel and cargo virtually consigned to sea-rovers, whom our rapacity will have provoked, and our own example more than justified.

I have but just entered upon the subject, which I announced in the opening of this letter, and must continue and complete it at another time.

The Globe plumply accuses Calhoun of a design to dissolve the Union, and form with Texas a southwestern confederacy. It is supposed that these editorial attacks upon Calhoun are written by Benton. *His* war now is for the succession after *Clay*, for the party *here* give it up for the next term, unless they can bring the election into the House of Representatives, which there is a faint hope of doing. The Globe has repeated, as if *by authority*, that if Van Buren is elected, Texas will be annexed in *one year*. I thought Mr. Van Buren's elaborate piece of *machiavelism* meant that when I first read it.

An affair has occurred, which is calculated to sink Mr. Calhoun, and his letter to Mr. Packenham, lower than ever.

You are aware that the last census contains gross and disgraceful errors, in regard to the colored "deaf and dumb," "blind," "insane and idiots," and "paupers." Dr. *Edward Jarvis*, of Dorchester, Massachusetts, exposed them very fully in the Boston Daily Advertiser, ten months ago, and the newspaper presses and medical journals throughout the free States, and to some extent in the South, republished the correction. But as a grand theory had been built upon these errors, very soothing to slaveholders and annexationists, viz.: that freedom makes all the colored people, deaf, dumb, blind, insane, iditos, and paupers, the slaveholders are extremely loth to give it up. *Hammett* gravely reproduced this nonsense in a speech on the *gag rule*.

Mr. *Severance*, of Maine, refuted it, giving a list of towns in his own State in which there were nineteen colored blind, insane, &c. but not one colored person. Senator Walker, of Mississippi, in his piratical pamphlet in favor of annexation, written eight months after, he ought to have known, and probably did know, that his data were all false, builds upon these airy nothings his vain argument. But the worst of all is that the Secretary of State, in his letter, which speaks for the nation to the British ministers and to the world, founds his main argument on Walker's trumpery? How creditably we shall appear! But the worst is to be told. Mr. Adams submitted a resolution calling upon the Secretary of State for information as to these errors, which was adopted without opposition. On Saturday Calhoun sent an answer to the House. What think you it was? Why, that he has no information of any errors in the census! He has either answered without examining, or he deliberately misrepresented. I do suppose that the latter is the case. He is unwilling to give official information which will upset his argument to Lord Aberdeen, but Aberdeen will have the facts before he replies, and Mr. Calhoun will be used up, suppress or prevaricate as he may. I guess he will hear from Mr. Adams!—D. L. C.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Society on Tuesday met according to notice, and is now continuing its sessions. The absence of the editor until Tuesday evening, and the necessity of going to press early on Wednesday morning, must be our apology for not giving, this week, some account of the speeches and proceedings.

Congress.

SENATE, MONDAY, April 29.

The following remonstrances against the annexation of *Texas* were presented.

By Mr. *Huntington*, from citizens of Middletown, Connecticut. Also from citizens of Norwich, Connecticut.

By Mr. *Clayton*, two from citizens of Delaware, very numerously signed.

By Mr. *Upham*, several from citizens of Vermont, very numerously signed, without distinction of party.

By Mr. *Tappan*, from citizens of Mount Pleasant Ohio.

By Mr. *Rives*, from citizens of Prince Edward county, signed without distinction of party in favor of annexation. Also, a remonstrance from citizens of Henrico county, against any interference with the tariff. Several other remonstrances against any interference with the tariff were presented.

The post-office bill was passed by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Archer, Atherton, Bayard, Buchanan, Clayton, Crittenden, Dayton, Fairfield, Francis, Henderson, Huntington, Jarnagin, Mangum, Merrick, Pearce, Porter, Rives, Simmons, Sturgeon, Upham, White, Woodbridge, and Woodbury—23.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Atchison, Bagby, Barrow, Benton, Breese, Foster, Fulton, Hannegan, Huger, Johnson, McDuffie, Semple, and Sevier—14.

Mr. *Dayton*, of New Jersey, addressed the Senate in support of the present tariff. Mr. D. insisted upon the importance of protection, as creating a market for agricultural products, and showed that in ten States the value of land had risen at the rate of 7 per cent. per annum.

In relation to the moral and social influences of manufactures, he cited the historical fact, that modern civilization and freedom had their origin among the artisans and operatives in the manufacturing towns of Flanders, Germany, and Britain.

TUESDAY, April 30.

The following remonstrances against the annexation of Texas, were presented.

By Mr. *Wright*, from citizens of Ontario county, New-York. Also, the proceedings of a meeting of citizens of New-York, in opposition to the annexation of Texas.

Mr. W. said this was a meeting over which Mr. Gallatin had presided, and, in compliance with a request of the parties, he would move that the document be read; which was agreed to.

By Mr. *Clayton*, from citizens of Delaware.

Three memorials from New Jersey, against any alteration of the tariff were presented.

The bill to encourage the settlement of *Oregon* was made the special order for Monday next.

Mr. *Niles*, senator elect from the State of Connecticut, appeared, and his credentials were presented by Mr. *Fairfield*, of Maine.

Mr. *Jarnagin*, of Tennessee, objected to the gentleman's receiving the oath. He observed that the honorable senator had been in the city several weeks without presenting himself to take his seat. It was well known that he had been visited by an afflicting malady, and it was due to the country and to the senator himself that an investigation should be had to satisfy the Senate and people, whether he was in a state to perform his legislative duties. He moved for a committee.

Mr. *Fairfield* stated that he was a fellow-boarder with Mr. Niles, and was of opinion that he was sound in mind, though suffering from physical debility. He said that Mr. Niles waived any objection to an investigation.

The *President* of the Senate desired Mr. JARNAGIN to reduce his motion to writing, which was done as follows:

Resolved, That the credentials presented to the Senate of the election of John M. Niles, to be a senator of the United States, from the State of Connecticut, be referred to a select committee consisting of five members, who shall be instructed to inquire into the election, return, and qualification of the said John M. Niles, and into his capacity at this time to take the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. *Crittenden* considered the case as one of great novelty and importance, and preferred that it should lie on the table until there was a full Senate. The resolution was passed, and Messrs. *Allen, Buchanan, Wright, Tappan*, and *Crittenden*, were appointed the committee.

WEDNESDAY, May 1.

Mr. *Clayton* presented the proceedings of a democratic meeting at Wilmington, Delaware, *in favor* of the annexation of *Texas*.

By Mr. *Haywood*, from citizens of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, strongly urging the annexation of *Texas*.

By Mr. *Bayard*, the proceedings of a democratic meeting, held in the town of Wilmington, *in favor* of the annexation of *Texas*.

By Mr. *Buchanan*, from citizens of the third congressional district of Pennsylvania, signed by highly respectable persons, *in favor* of the annexation of *Texas*.

Also, from citizens of Washington county, in the same State, warmly remonstrating against the annexation of *Texas*.

Mr. *Wright*, of New-York, presented the remonstrance of the citizens of Onondaga county against the annexation of *Texas*.

Mr. *Talmadge*, of New-York, presented several memorials from that State against any alteration of the tariff.

The Senate adjourned to *Friday*.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, April 22.

Mr. *Albert Smith* presented the petition of C. O. Shepard and 111 others, citizens of the county of Wyoming, New-York, praying Congress to reject the application of any State or territory that may be asked to be admitted to the Union with a Constitution tolerating slavery.

Two remonstrances against any alteration of the tariff, were presented.

The western-harbors and rivers-improvement bill was taken up on a motion to reconsider the vote whereby it was *passed*. The House refused to reconsider; *yeas* 73, *nays* 111.

Mr. *Barnard*, of New-York, moved to suspend the rules, so as to take up the eastern-harbors and rivers-improvement bill. Negatived; *yeas* 105, *nays* 88.

Mr. *McKay* having given notice on a former day that he should make a *final* effort on this morning to take up the tariff, now moved a call of the House, which was proceeded with until 189 members answered to their names.

Mr. *McKay* moved to go into committee of the whole on the state of the Union, to take up the tariff, and on this motion there were *yeas* 104, *nays* 94.

Several motions were now made to amend the bill, so as to have it take effect on January 1st, 1845, or '46, or '47, instead of September 1st, as is now in the bill. These were all negatived. On the motion for 1846, the vote was 70 to 73.

Mr. *McKay* moved the *1st day of July*, next, but no decision as to the time, was made.

Mr. *Seymour*, of New-York, moved to substitute thirty *per cent.* for *fifteen*, on coarse wools, costing 7 cents a pound, and under.

Mr. *Owen*, of Indiana, then addressed the House in support of the bill. He assumed that the design of the present law was to imitate the high protective system of Great Britain; and he then gave details of suffering and starvation in Liverpool, and Manchester, all which he attributed to manufacturers, and the protective policy of England.

Mr. *Wright*, of Indiana, contended that the happy change in the affairs of the country, was not owing to the tariff.

Cave Johnson, of Tennessee, moved that 10 o'clock, A. M. be the hour of meeting in future. Negatived. Mr. J. gave notice that he should move it to-morrow.

TUESDAY, April 23.

Mr. *Hopkins*, of Virginia, moved a call of the House, which proceeded some time, and then was dispensed with.

[The reason of this unusual movement at the first hour of the morning was, that Mr. *Cave Johnson*, and others, who had been in favor of meeting at 10 *o'clock*, were not at this hour, 11 1-4 o'clock, yet in their seats! So the call went on until it fixed the fact that those gentlemen were among the *missing*.]

Mr. *Wright*, of Indiana, concluded his speech on the tariff, contending that no home market can ever take the surplus produce of the West, that the tariff injures the South, and at the South takes western produce, whatever injures her, injures the West. The tariff of 1842, he contended, was a bill of the capitalists to oppress the poor.

Mr. *White*, of Kentucky, asked the indulgence of the House if he now availed himself of an opportunity he had repeatedly waved, of going into a reply to some political matters which had been brought forward. He then proceeded to exhibit evidence to overthrow the charge of "bargain and corruption," lately revived against Messrs. *Adams* and *Clay*. Mr. White not having finished when his hour expired, asked permission to occupy a little more time. Mr. *Rathbun*, of New-York, said something. The *speaker* decided that, according to the rules, even *two-thirds* could not give Mr. White leave to go on.

Mr. *Brinkerhoff*, of Ohio, was now proceeding to speak on the tariff, when Mr. *Rathbun*, of New-York, was seen to leap from his seat, and give Mr. White, who was near him, a blow, which Mr. W. returned as bad as he could, both the parties being immediately surrounded, and their arms held by several members. During this *mêlée*, a stranger, of the name of *Moore*, of Kentucky, either being on the floor, or rushing in at the moment, in either case, without any right, was ordered out by a doorkeeper, and not going, a scuffle ensued, in which Moore got he doorkeeper by the collar. A member, Mr. *McCauslin*, came to the aid of the doorkeeper, and the two succeeded in putting Moore out. Then he drew a pistol, and aimed at Mr. McCauslin; but a person standing near, seized Moore's arm on the instant, and so deranged his aim, that he missed McCauslin, and perforated the door leading into the House, and wounded a doorkeeper within the hall, in the fleshy part of the thigh. Subsequently, various propositions were made, some to investigate, and some directly to punish the parties by *expulsion*, or *censure*: meantime, Mr. *White*, and Mr. *Rathbun* became reconciled, made each an apology and submission to the House, and shook hands in its presence. [*Great applause.*] Finally the subject was referred to a select committee, to investigate and report upon the case, and also a law, if they think proper, punishing offenses committed within the capitol, or its grounds.

Moore was ordered to be taken into custody by the sergeant-at-arms, where he now remains. *McCauslin* took from him a pair of pistols and a *Bowie* knife.

Various reports are abroad as to the provocation for the attack, by Rathbun, but there has been no authentic statement of the words which passed before the blows.

This affair occupied nearly the whole day to a late hour. Mr. *White* took occasion at the close of the proceedings to say, that he had never had any acquaintance with the person who fired the pistol.

WEDNESDAY, April 24.

Mr. *Grinnel*, of Massachusetts, presented the remonstrance of Peleg Sloeum and others, of Dartmouth, against the annexation of Texas.

Two remonstrances from Pennsylvania, against any alteration of the tariff, were presented.

Mr. *Kennedy*, of Indiana, and Mr. *White*, of Kentucky, severally asked leave to make personal explanations in relation to misreports which had been made in the newspapers, of their remarks of the preceding day. Objections were made, and the House refused to suspend the rules. The ground was taken by some, that the custom of permitting members to reply here to newspaper statements was wrong, and ought to be discontinued.

[Mr. White's purpose was to contradict a statement in the *Globe*, in which the writer pretended to give the words, and to state the circumstances, which had preceded and attended the rencontre between Messrs. White and Rathbun. Mr. White said he had not permitted himself to make any statement, although repeatedly applied to on the subject, it being under investigation by a committee.]

Mr. *Brinkerhoff*, of Ohio, addressed the House in committee of the whole, in opposition to the present tariff. He contended that, as there was always a large deficit of wheat in Great Britain, we might supply it, if we would import sufficiently from that country to make up return cargoes for vessels carrying out breadstuffs. He scouted the idea of a possible *home* market adequate to the consumption of the surplus grains of the West; and insisted that the manufacturing system greatly degraded and demoralized the people.

Mr. *Wethered*, of Maryland, advocated the present tariff. He is a manufacturer, and showed, by reference to a variety of articles of large consumption, that prices had been reduced by protection. Shirtings which used to sell for 25 or 30 cents a yard, were now obtained, of better fabric, for 12 cents. Mousselines de laines, which, while they were exclusively imported from France, cost $2.25, now that we manufactured them, were reduced to $1.50. Like reductions had taken place, from the like cause, on hats, boots, and broadcloths. Half the protection on woolens goes, he said, to the wool-growers. He called the bill now offered, "a British bill," and said that Queen Victoria, if her former subject [Mr. Owen] should go with his speech and this bill, and present them to her majesty, on his knees, she would bid him "rise up, Sir Robert Owen." The chairman of the committee of ways and means would probably be created Earl McKay, and the gentleman from Virginia, Duke Dromgoole, for their important services in supporting British interests.

Mr. *J. P. Kennedy*, of Maryland, expressed great satisfaction that the report of the democratic and southern committee of ways and means had admitted and established beyond the power of the party to controvert it, that there had been a *deficient revenue*, and an increasing debt for *seven years*, including the whole term of Mr. Van Buren. He hoped this authority would put that question at rest. The report also charged the whigs as the *authors* of the tariff of 1842. That was right. He hoped that henceforth we should hear no more of democrats in the interior of Pennsylvania, New-York, and other quarters, claiming the glory of it, as a democratic measure, passed by democratic votes. The committee had further stated that, as the duties had not reached the lowest point to which by the compromise act they were destined, "the treasury had not been absolutely *closed*." He [Mr. K.] wanted the people of the South to take note of what a southern committee admitted to be the operation of the compromise act upon the revenue of the country. He adverted to the fear of the people's being informed on this subject, implied in the refusal to print a single extra copy of the report of the committee on manufactures in favor of the present tariff, while 20,000 extras had been printed of the report of the committee of ways and means, against it!

The present bill had been brought in avowedly to *increase* the revenue, and was based on a report of the Secretary of the Treasury, that there would be a deficiency this year, of $3,000,000. But behold, in the course of six weeks the revenue had so increased that it was now certain that there would be a surplus. Whereupon the advocates of the bill turn right round, and tell us that it will *reduce* the revenue! Mr. K. commented facetiously, and to the great merriment of the House, upon the malleability of the iron duty, which this anti-protective committee had hammered out to 100 per cent. to gain Pennsylvania; and upon their sweetening the bill to the palate of Louisiana by a duty of 100 per cent. on sugar, 203 per cent. on the juice of the cane, and 203 per cent. on spirits distilled from *molasses*, while 100 per cent. was laid on spirits distilled from *grain!*

Mr. *E. J. Morris*, of Pennsylvania, attributed the return of ease, contentment, and prosperity in the country, to the tariff of 1842. He replied to Mr. Owen's details of misery among the operatives in England, and contended that it existed not in consequence of protection, but in spite of it. There was equal misery among the agricultural population. He spoke with great admiration of the factory girls of Lowell, praising their intelligence and virtue.

Mr. *Owen*, by permission of Mr. Hunt, of New-York, who had obtained the floor, replied to a reflection of Mr. Wethered, upon his [Mr. O's] foreign birth. He pointed to the portrait of Lafayette, (which hangs in the hall opposite to Washington's,) and willingly left it to the House to determine on which side the advantage lay, his [Mr. Owen's] who had become a citizen of a free republic *from choice*, or his [Mr. Wethered's] who was so by accident.

Mr. *Wethered* retorted that the difference between Lafayette and the gentleman, [Mr. Owen,] was, that the former came to help us achieve our independence; but the latter, virtually to destroy it.

[This sort of attack, I am glad to say, appeared to be disapproved by the general sense of the House.]

Mr. *Hunt*, of New-York, then went into a general argument in favor of the existing tariff.

THURSDAY, April 25.

The death of *Pierre Evariste Bossier*, a member from Louisiana, was announced with the usual formality by Mr. *Slidell*, and the orders for mourning, adjournment, and attendance at the funeral to-morrow, were adopted.

FRIDAY, April 26.

The funeral services were performed in the Hall of the House by Catholic priests, the deceased having been of that persuasion. The Senate and cabinet were in attendance.

[The Sermon by Doctor *Matthew Rider*, President of Georgetown college, was an eloquent performance, but too much in the spirit of *propaganda* for such an occasion. One thing I was glad to hear, and that was a faithful rebuke of the *House* for the scandalous disorders and outrages committed so frequently on its floor. I may be mistaken, I hope I am; but the conviction was and is strong upon my mind that there is not a *Protestant priest* throughout the land, who would have had the manliness, and independence to have uttered in the teeth of these proud and powerful offenders such a stern and honest condemnation. I was disgusted, as I have often been before by the mummeries of the Catholic rites, but I must do homage to the superior moral grandeur of this intrepid and truthful testimony. It produced contempt and scorn in many, but high admiration in me. In saying this I have tried faintly to imitate the fidelity which I admired.

Anti-Slavery Items.

SOMETHING NEW.—A colored man has taken an office in Exchange street, and intends to practice law in this city.—*Portland Zion's Advocate.*

NATURE'S NOBILITY.—By a colonial ordinance of the governor of Guadeloupe of the 17th of July, a slave of the name of Felix has been emancipated as a reward for his generous conduct on the awful day of the earthquake, the 8th of February; 2,000 francs have been voted for that purpose by the colonial council, 1,500 francs being paid to Felix's master, and 500 francs to Felix himself, as a gift. This is the story as contained in the report to the council: "On the 8th February two brothers were covered with the ruins around them; one of them fortunately succeeded in extricating himself unhurt, but the other was wounded and dying, and his more fortunate brother was for some time trying, with his precious load, to find his way out; but the obstacles were insurmountable, his strength was exhausted, and the flames of conflagration were rapidly approaching. At that distressing hour he finds Felix by his side. 'My friend,' he says, 'if you have a kind heart, help me to save my brother, and I will give you a doubloon.' '*To-day nothing for money, all for the love of God*,' replied the noble and generous slave; and, collecting all his strength and energy, he surmounts all obstacles, and arrives on the wharf, where he lays the dying man in a boat." It is with the utmost difficulty that Felix has been discovered, so anxious was he to conceal his noble conduct.—*Gazette Officielle.*

PREJUDICE PASSING AWAY.—Rev. H. H. Garnett colored preacher of the Presbyterian church of Troy, New York, has been unanimously elected a member of the "Young Men's Association" of that city, one of the oldest and most effective literary societies of the country. Mr. Garnett was once a slave.

Rev. Dr. Porter, of Farmington, Connecticut, one of the oldest and most repectable Congregational ministers of the State, lately exchanged pulpits with Rev. Mr Pennington, a colored Congregational minister, of great moral worth and intellectual power, of Hartford.

THE SLAVE TRADE.—The British government have added considerably to the steam squadron on the coast of Africa, for the prevention of the slave-trade. The following is the list of this formidable steam force:—Promotheus 22, Commodore Jones, Hecate, Promotheus, Aydra, Thunderbolt, Wilberforce, Soudan, Firebrand, and another vessel.

A HARD CASE.—We are informed that there lived, a number of years since, in North Carolina, a free colored man who became attached to a female slave, but before he could marry her, he was forced to purchase her, and accordingly he paid a fair and valuable consideration for her. By the law of the State she then became his slave, but was not so regarded by him. They were married, and raised a family of children, all of whom they supposed would be free. But a few years since this black man died, and a brother, being the next of kin who was free, became his heir, for slaves, we believe, cannot inherit property. This brother claimed the children of his brother as his *slaves*, and actually sold them as such. Some philanthropic friends endeavored to set the claim aside, but it could not be done, and those children are now held slaves, made such by an inhuman uncle.—*Richmond (Indiana) Palladium.*

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

The Servile Insurrection in Cuba.—We are permitted to make the following extract from a letter of a recent date, written by an American gentleman in Cuba to his friend in this city:

"At this time we are under very great excitement, in consequence of a servile insurrection having recently been discovered in the island, and particularly in this vicinity. Whites and blacks are alike implicated, and many American citizens have been arrested and placed in irons and in the stocks, whom we have every reason to believe innocent. They are arrested merely on the single accusation or extorted evidence of a slave, under the torture of the lash. The most trifling conversation, or the least suspicious act, is sufficient to send one to prison, where he is neither allowed opportunity for defense, or the consolation or sympathies of his friends and countrymen. There is a strong feeling against Americans, and the impression that the government will seek no redress, which I most heartily hope may prove without foundation. Fear and terror are depicted on the countenances of all foreigners, and every one expects that he may be the next victim."—*Commercial Advertiser.*

Hayti.—It is reported that the blacks have broken into Aux Cayes and murdered the whites and mulattoes; that the President is killed. Four hundred persons have taken refuge in Jamaica. In Port au Prince a similar attempt as at Aux Cayes was hourly apprehended.

There was every probability that the insurgents would accomplish their object, which was to put down a military and establish a civil government, such as was promised, after Boyer was expelled.

Anti-Texas Meeting in Lake County.—A large anti-Texas meeting was held at Painsville, Lake county, on the 5th instant at which Isaac Gillett presided, assisted by Judge Bissell, General Paine, and Colonel Morse, Vice Presidents. Several excellent resolutions were passed; among others, the following:

"*Resolved*, That we cannot and will not support any man for any executive or legislative office, in the national government, who is not *openly* opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union."

This was adopted by an unanimous vote, all rising in its favor. The people of Northern Ohio do not do things by halves.—*Cinn. Morn. Her.*

The Uncertainty of Law.—Marsh, who was lately tried in New Jersey, for arson and murder, was found guilty by the jury. His friends made urgent solicitation for a second trial, on the ground that his senior counsel had been too ill to sum up the case to the jury. The evidence was all heard, and the junior counsel had summed up the case; but the illness afforded a plea for another trial. Chief Justice Hornblower publicly gave his opinion that the man was undoubtedly guilty, and all the associate judges, agreed with him, that a second trial could not possibly result otherwise than the first. Yet, on the second trial, he proved an alibi, and was acquitted.

Died.

At her residence, in Peru, Clinton county, New-York, on the 16th of 4th month, 1844, JEMIMA KEESE, widow of the late William Keese, in the 66th year of her age; of an inflammation succeeding a paralysis. The blank she has left in the circle of her family and friends will not readily be filled. From her youth, she was an approved and highly esteemed minister of the Society of Friends. By her agreeable intercourse with a widely extended family connexion, and her numerous, extensive, and acceptable visits and gospel labors, among Friends and others, large numbers of all classes become warmly attached to her tender spirit, and deeply interested in her sympathetic mind. Believing in progress and reform, and being ardently solicitous for the prevalence of justice, mercy, and truth, she became an advocate for the cause of the oppressed, a fast friend of the temperance reform, a promoter of brotherly love, an example in extending charity to others, and a promulgator of the gospel of peace. Her life and conversation, sickness and death, showed that a plentiful harvest of the peaceable fruits of righteousness had been gathered in this life, and laid up in store for an inheritance in the next; to the possession of which she evinced herself ready to depart.—[COMMUNICATED.

TREASURER'S RECEIPTS

For two weeks ending 5th mo. (May) 4th, 1844.

Received for the Standard—The following persons have each paid $2: Isaac Stearns, Franklin city, Mass.; H. N. Bill, Bozrahville, Ct.; John Wright, Alleghany, Pa.; Asa Bebee, Mexico, N. Y.; J. Bradford, Canterbury, Ct.; J. Morse, do.; W. B. Swan, Newport, R. I.; Martin Bowen, Knoxville, Pa.; Mrs. Alexander Pope; A. M. Merine, Utica, N. Y.; David Ketcham, Pleasant Valley, N. Y.; H. Willis, Jericho, L. I.—Total, $24.

Francis Kelley, Blackstone, $5; W. Leavitt, Washington, Ct. $3; Den. Merril, Methuen, Mass. $4; Anson Ames, Mexico, N. Y. $4; Kilburn & Dudley, Litchfield, Ct. $1.50; A. S. Cooke, Clinton, Mass. 12 cents; P. F. Akee, do. 12 cents; Joseph Strain, Albany, $3; A. C. Tuttle, Nashville, Ohio, $1; Warren Delano, Fairhaven, Mass. $4; Charles Kellogg, Burlington, N. Y. $1; S. W. Dwight, Clinton, N. Y. $1; Thomas W. Thorndyke, Weare, N. H. $1; Abraham Van Eps, Vernon, N. Y. $3; W. H. Dennis, Nantucket, 50 cents; A. Dickson, Watervale, N. Y. 68 cents; Caroline Weston, New Bedford, $4.—Total, $36.93.

Donations.—S. Howland, Scipioville, N. Y. $1.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, *Treasurer.*

NOTICES.

THE ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

This annual effort for the sustentation of the anti-slavery cause, will be made in Amory Hall, Boston, commencing on Tuesday, December 24th, 1844. By its means it is, that the debts of the cause, last year, were discharged; so that it is, at this moment, free to put its unencumbered strength, in the prosecution of THE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS, through the medium of which, this appeal reaches you. If you wish slavery to cease, you cannot more effectually aid in its extinction, than by upholding this Fair. The experience of ten years enables the women of Massachusetts to present it to you as an effectual channel, through which your sympathy may unite with that of others, to swell the flood of effort by which high principle shall be diffused, and right feeling excited, till the horrible institution of slavery shall be swept away.

None of the funds raised by means of this Fair are ever permitted to run to waste in building up a political party, or in defraying electioneering expenses. They are used to promulgate, through the press, and by the living voice, the truths of freedom, which convert men's hearts to the cause. We give a guaranty for the economical and judicious disposal of them, by providing for their expenditure by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Without going back for years, to recapitulate former help, the beneficial consequences of which are in perpetual glow, we will simply state that the proceeds of this last year's Fair were TWENTY-ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS, exclusive of many small appropriations, and the necessary expenses; and that, lacking the prospect of this aid, neither the Hundred Western Conventions, nor the Hundred Conventions now in progress through Massachusetts would have been undertaken. The influence of the cause might be increased ten-fold, by means of that aid from the commonwealth generally, which it is disposed, if the way were open, to afford. A few words of suggestion may open this way. Permit us to make them for the cause's sake.

First. We entreat whomsoever this sheet reaches, instantly to announce an intention of aiding the ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR, and to form, if possible, a little circle for weekly anti-slavery effort through the year. Gain all the aid possible, but *wait for no one else*. Whoever begins will be the nucleus round which much help will gather at length.

Second. To remember that there is nothing useful or ornamental—no mechanical, agricultural, or manufacturing product—nothing either to eat, drink, or wear—no work of taste or art, for household use or decoration—but will (so perfect have our arrangements at length become) be made as available to the cause as its worth in money.

Third. To correspond with us for the purpose of benefiting us by

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

AN OLD MAN'S SOLILOQUY.

"Oh, that I had the wings of a Dove,
Then would I fly away and be at rest."

I am sick of the world, I am sick of its strife,
I am tired of living this wearisome life;
Oh, that with the wings of a dove I were blest,
For then would I soar to a haven of rest.

I would leave far behind me the world and its cares,
Its daily commotions, temptations, and snares,
And bidding adieu to all scenes here below,
How quickly in raptures to Heaven I'd go.

I have lived many years, amidst sorrow and pain,
I have seen earth's most sacred ties broken in twain,
Bright youth, health, and happiness, long since have fled,
And friends I once cherished now sleep with the dead.

I have found that the beauty of summer is brief,
That soon it gives place to the seared autumn leaf;
And the summer of life I have often seen strown
With the leaves which have been by life's autumn gales blown.

I have once seen the time when youth's visions were bright,
All my dreams of the future wore the same golden light,
Young Hope flung his rays pure and bright o'er the same,
Fancy's magical finger then colored the flame.

I still have my visions, but different from those;
They haunt me at night when I seek my repose;
And oft through the day, when I bend on my knee,
Those visions of heavenly bliss I can see.

Hope still journeys with me and cheers by the way;
'Tis hope that supports from day unto day;
By hope scenes of bliss in the future I trace,
But Fancy has gone and *Faith* taken her place.

And now my bent form, and my locks turning gray,
Speak plainer than words of old age and decay;
They tell me in darkness I soon must lie low,
And my God I will thank that I'm ready to go.

Oh, yes, I am sick of the world and its strife,
I am tired of living this wearisome life;
Oh, that with the wings of a dove I were blest,
For then would I soar to a haven of rest. M. B.

SPRING VALLEY, Ohio.

From the Public Ledger.

GO NOT TO THE SOUTH.

Answer to the Stanzas, "Come to the South," which appeared in the Ledger of the 20th ultimo.

Go not "to the South, sweet, beautiful one,"
For "the clime of the heart," or "the shrine of the sun;"
Though "the sky ever shines with a passionate glow,"
And "the flowers spread their treasures of crimson and show;"
Though "the breeze, o'er bright waters, wafts incense along,
And gay birds are glancing in beauty and song:"
Oppression reigns ever o'er mountain and plain,
"And the best gifts of Eden" are cursed with its chain.

Go not to the South,
'Tis Liberty's grave;
Its "crimson and show"
Are the blood of the slave!

Go not to the South, though they "build thee a home,
Where winter shall never intrusively come;"
The blast of Oppression shall chill thy heart more
Than the purer fierce north wind of Freedom's blest shore.
The vine "round thy dwelling," may "shade thee at noon,
While birds of all music keep amorous tune;"
But "the gush" of hearts broken by outrage and crime,
And the sound of the slave-whip with "music" shall chime.

Go not to the South,
Where such deeds are done;
Nor dwell in its bowers,
Sweet, beautiful one!

Oh! when shall the South be "the home of the heart,"
And Liberty's fire its "deep passion impart?"
"The glow of its summer" be "felt in the soul,"
"And love" for our brother keep "fervent control?"
Oh! then "would thy beauty most brilliantly beam,"
And thy life of sweet virtue be more than a "dream."
'Till then its professions ne'er real can be,
Nor the "beautiful land seem an Eden to thee."

With joy to the South,
May its jubilee come,
Then "dwell in its bowers,
Sweet, beautiful one!"

Oh! think of the crushed ones of a darker hue,
Of thy sisters bereft of the right and the true;
And tell the gay Southron, who wooes thee to come,
First make thy fair domicil Liberty's home;
Thy flowers shall be fragrant, thy music more sweet,
When the image of God must not crouch at thy feet:
Thy love shall be purer, and welcome to mine,
When thou givest to thy brother the joys that are thine.

Then I'll come to the South,
The home of the free,
"And dwell in its bowers,"
With Virtue and thee.

From Heath's Book of Beauty, for 1844.

CONTENT AND DESIRE.

BY BULWER.

There rested on a heap of stone
A quiet, but shadowy form;
A thousand tempests there had blown,
And still as calm it kept its throne—
A smiler on the storm!

There skimm'd the earth and roved the air
A shape on restless wings,
Forever, be it foul or fair,
Fluttering, and seeking here and there
For undiscovered things.

An angel came from Heaven, and bore
The silent shade on high,
Half seen, with dim clouds floating o'er,
To dwell, and smile for evermore
Within the farthest sky!

The flutterer on the wing, that ne'er
Till then a goal had guessed,
Beholds the silent shadow there,
Skims earth no more, but through the air,
Forever upward, seeks to share,
In vain the calm one's rest!

A guide, that leads all human kind,
That winged fool is given—
For aye to seek, and ne'er to find
Till earth be over—the shade enshrined
In clouds,—but clouds of Heaven!

If all the forest leaves had speech,
And talked with one rhetoric fit,
What wonder would arise in *each*,
That all would not attend to *it*!—STERLING.

Miscellany.

From Dumas's Work on Naples.

THE EX-DEY OF ALGIERS.

In the first, we are informed of M. Dumas's installation at the Hotel Vittoria, kept by M. Martin Zill, who, besides being an innkeeper, is a man of much taste in art, a distinguished antiquary, an amateur of pictures, a collector of autographs and curiosities. Appropos of the hotel, we have an anecdote of the ex-Dey of Algiers, who, on being dispossessed of his dominions by the French, took refuge at Naples, and established himself under M. Zill's hospitable roof. The third floor was occupied entirely by his suite and attendants, the fourth was for himself and his treasures, the fifth, or the garrets, he converted into his harem. The curious arms, costumes, and jewels, which Hussein Pacha had brought with him, were a godsend to the virtuous tavernkeeper, who was never weary of examining and admiring them; and, before the African had been a week in the house, he and his host were sworn friends. Unfortunately, this harmony was not destined to last very long.

One morning, Hussein Pacha's cook (a Nubian as black as ink, as shining as if he had been polished with a shoe-brush) entered the kitchen of the hotel, and asked for the largest knife they had. The head cook gave him a sort of carving-knife, some eighteen inches long, sharp as a razor, and pliant as a foil. The negro looked at it, shook his head, as if in doubt whether it would do, but nevertheless took it up stairs with him. Presently he brought it down again, and asked for a larger one. The cook opened all his drawers, and at last found a sort of cutlass, which he hardly ever used, on account of its enormous size. With this, the Nubian appeared more satisfied, and again went up stairs. Five minutes afterwards he came down for the third time, and returned the knife, asking for a bigger one still. The cook's curiosity was excited, and he inquired who wanted the knife, and for what purpose.

The African told him very coolly, that the Dey having left his dominions rather in a hurry, had forgotten to bring an executioner with him, he had consequently ordered his cook to get a large knife, and cut off the head of Osmin, chief of the eunuchs, who was convicted of having kept such negligent watch and ward over his highness's seraglio, that some presumptuous Giaour had made a hole in the wall, and established a communication with Zaida, the Dey's favorite *odalisque*. Accordingly, Osmin was to be decapitated; and as to the offending lady, the next time the Dey took an airing in the bay of Naples, she would be put into the boat in a sack, and consigned to the keeping of the kelpies. Thunderstruck at such summary proceedings, the cook desired his Nubian brother to wait, while he went for a larger knife; then hastening to M. Martin Zill, he told him what he had just heard.

M. Martin Zill ran to the minister of police, and laid the matter before him. His excellency got into his carriage, and went to call upon the Dey.

He found his highness reclining upon a divan, his back supported by cushions, smoking latakia in a chibouque, while an icoglan scratched the soles of his feet, and two slaves fanned him. The minister made his three salaams; the Dey nodded his head.

"Your highness," said his excellency, "I am the minister of police."

"I know you are," answered the Dey.

"Then your highness probably conjectures the motive of my visit."

"No. But you are welcome, all the same."

"I come to prevent your highness from committing a crime."

"A crime! And what crime?" said the Dey, taking the pipe from his mouth, and gazing at his interlocutor in the most profound astonishment!

"I wonder your highness should ask the question," replied the minister. "Is it not your intention to cut off Osmin's head?"

"That is no crime," answered the Dey.

"Does not your highness purpose throwing Zaida into the sea?"

"That is no crime," repeated the Dey. "I bought Osmin for five hundred piasters, and Zaida for a thousand sequins, just as I bought this pipe for a hundred ducats."

"Well," said the minister, "what does your highness deduce from that?"

"That as the pipe belongs to me, as I have bought it, and paid for it, I may break it to atoms, if I choose, and nobody has a right to object. So saying, the pacha broke his pipe, and threw the fragments into the middle of the room.

"All very well, as far as a pipe goes," said the minister; "but Osmin, but Zaida!"

"How! less than a pipe! A man less than a pipe! A woman less than a pipe!"

"Osmin is not a man, and Zaida is not a woman; they are slaves. I will cut off Osmin's head, and throw Zaida into the sea."

"No! said the magistrate. "Not at Naples, at least."

"Dog of a Christian!" shouted the Dey, "do you know who I am?"

"You are the ex-Dey of Algiers, and I am the Neapolitan minister of police; and, if your Deyship is impertinent, I shall send him to prison, added the minister, very coolly.

"To prison!" repeated the Dey, falling back upon his divan."

"To prison," replied the minister.

"Very well," said Hussein. "I leave Naples tonight."

"Your highness is as free as air, to go and come. Nevertheless, I must make one condition. Before your departure, you will swear by the prophet, that no harm shall be done to Osmin or Zaida."

"Osmin and Zaida belong to me, and I shall do what I please with them."

"Then your highness will be pleased to deliver them over to me, to be punished according to the laws of the country; and until you do so, you will not be allowed to leave Naples."

"Who will prevent me?"

"I will."

"The pacha laid his hand on his dagger. The minister stepped to the window, and made a sign. The next moment the tramp of heavy boots, and jingle of spurs, were heard upon the stairs; the door opened, and a gigantic corporal of gend'armes made his appearance; his right hand raised to his cocked hat, his left hand upon the seat of his trowsers.

"Gennarro," said the minister of police, "if I give you an order to arrest this gentleman, would you see any difficulty in executing it?"

"None, your excellency."

"You are aware that this gentleman's name is Hussein Pacha?"

"I was not, your excellency."

"And that he is Dey of Algiers?"

"May it please your excellency, I don't know what that is."

"You see!" said the minister, turning to the Dey.

"The devil!" exclaimed Hussein.

"Shall I?" said Gennarro, taking a pair of handcuffs from his pocket, and advancing a pace toward the Dey, who, on his part, took a step baskward.

"No," replied the minister, "it will not be necessary. His highness will do as he is bid. Go and search the hotel for a man named Osmin, and a woman named Zaida, and take them both to the perfecture."

"What!" cried the Dey; "this man is to enter my harem?"

"He is not a man," replied the minister; "he is a corporal of gend'armes. But if you do not wish him to go, send for Osmin and Zaida yourself."

"Will you promise to have them punished?" inquired the Dey.

"Certainly; according to the utmost rigor of the law."

Hussein Pacha clapped his hands. A door concealed behind the tapestry, was opened, and a slave entered the room.

Bring down Osmin and Zaida," said the Dey.

The slave crossed his hands on his breast, bowed his head, and disappeared without uttering a word. The next instant he came back with the two culprits.

The eunuch was a little round, fat fellow, with beardless face, and small hands and feet. Zaida was a beautiful Circassian, her eyelids painted with kool, her teeth blackened with betel, her nails reddened with henna. On perceiving Hussein Pacha, the eunuch fell upon his knees; Zaida raised her head. The Dey's eyes flashed, and he clutched the hilt of his kanigar. Osmin grew pale; Zaida smiled. The minister of police made a sign to the gend'arme, who stepped up to the two captives, handcuffed them, and led them out of the room. As the door closed behind them, the Dey uttered a sound between a sigh and a roar.

The magistrate looked out of the window, till he saw the prisoners and their escort disappear at the corner of the Strada Chiatamene. Then turning to the Dey—

"Your highness is now at liberty to leave Naples, if he wishes so to do," said the impurturbable functionary, with a low bow.

"This very instant!" cried Hussein. I will not remain another moment in such a barbarous country as yours."

"A pleasant journey to your highness," said the minister.

"Go to the devil!" retorted Hussein.

Before an hour had elapsed, the Dey had chartered a small vessel, on board of which he embarked the same evening, with his suite, his wives, and his treasures; and at midnight he set sail, cursing the tyranny that prevented a man from drowning his wife, and cutting off the heads of his slaves. The next day the minister of police had the culprits brought before him, and examined. Osmin was found guilty of having slept when he ought to have watched, and Zaida, of having watched when she ought to have slept. But, by some strange omission, the Neapolitan code allots no punishment to such offenses; and consequently, Osmin and Zaida, to their infinite astonishment, were immediately set at liberty. Osmin took to selling pastiles for a livelihood, and the lady got employment as *dame de comptoir*, in a coffeehouse. As to the Dey, he had left Naples with the intention of going to England, in which country, as he had been informed, a man is at liberty to sell his wife, if he may not drown her. He was taken ill, however, on the road, and obliged to stop at Leghorn, where he died.

From "The Dial" for April.

THE YOUNG AMERICAN.

BY RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

I call upon you, young men, to obey your heart, and be the nobility of this land. In every age of the world, there has been a leading nation, one of a more generous sentiment, whose eminent citizens were willing to stand for the interests of general justice and humanity, at the risk of being called, by the men of the moment, chimerical and fantastic. Which should be that nation, but these States? Which should lead that movement, if not New England? Who should lead the leaders, but the Young American? The people, and the world, is now suffering from the want of religion and honor in its public mind. In America, out of doors all seems a market; in doors, an air-tight stove of conventionalism. Everybody who comes into our houses savors of these precious habits; the men of the market, the women of the custom. I find no expression in our State papers or legislative debates, in our lyceums, or churches, specially in our newspapers, of a high national feeling, no lofty counsels that rightfully stir the blood. I speak of those organs which can be presumed to speak a popular sense. They recommend only conventional virtues, whatever will earn and preserve property; always the capitalist; the college, the church, the hospital, the theatre, the hotel, the road, the ship, of the capitalist—whatever goes to secure, adorn, enlarge these, is good; what jeopardizes any of these, is damnable. The "opposition" papers, so called, are on the same side. They attack the great capitalist, but with the aim to make a capitalist of the poor man. The opposition is between the ins and the outs; between those who have money, and those who wish to have money. But who announces to us in journal, or in pulpit, or in the street,

"Man alone
Can perform the impossible?"

I take pleasure in adding the succeeding lines from the ode of a German poet:

"He distinguishes,
Chooses, and judges,
He can impart to the
Moment duration.

Noble be man,
Helpful and good!
Since that alone
Distinguishes him
From all the beings
Which we know.

Hail to the unknown
Higher powers,
Whom we divine!
His pattern teach us
Faith in them!"

I shall not need to go into an enumeration of our national defects and vices which require this order of censors in the State. I might not set down our most proclaimed offenses as the worst. It is not often the worst trait that occasions the loudest outcry. Men complain of their suffering, and not of the crime. I fear little from the bad effect of repudiation; I do not fear that it will spread. Stealing is a suicidal business; you cannot repudiate but once. But the bold face, and tardy repentance permitted to this local mischief, reveal a public mind so pre-occupied with the love of gain, that the common sentiment of indignation at fraud does not act with its natural force. The more need of a withdrawal from the crowd, and a resort to the fountain of right, by the brave. The timidity of our public opinion is our disease; or, shall I say publicness of opinion, the absence of private opinion. Good nature is plentiful, but we want justice, with hearts of steel, to fight down the proud. The private mind has the access to the totality of goodness and truth, that it may be a balance to a corrupt society; and to stand for the private verdict against popular clamor, is the office of the noble. If a humane measure is propounded in behalf of the slave, or of the Irishman, or the Catholic, or for the succor of the poor, that sentiment, that project, will have the homage of the hero. That is his nobility, his oath of knighthood, to succor the helpless and oppressed; always to throw himself on the side of weakness, of youth, of hope; on the liberal, on the expansive side, never on the defensive, the conserving, the timorous, the lock and bolt system. More than our good will we may not be able to give. We have our own affairs, our own genius, which chains us to our proper work. We cannot give our life to the cause of the debtor, of the slave, or the pauper, as another is doing; but one thing we are bound to, not to blaspheme the sentiment and the work of that man, not to throw stumbling blocks in the way of the abolitionist, the philanthropist, as the organs of influence and opinion are swift to do. It is for us to confide in the beneficent Supreme Power, and not to rely on our money, and on the State because it is the guard of money. At this moment, the terror of old people and of vicious people, is lest the Union of these States be destroyed. As if the Union had any other real basis than the good pleasure of a majority of the citizens to be united! But the wise and just man will always feel that he stands on his own feet; that he imparts strength to the State, not receives security from it; and that if all went down, he, and such as he, would quite easily combine in a new and better constitution. Every great and memorable community has consisted of formidable individuals, who, like the Roman, or the Spartan, lent his own spirit to the State and so made it great. Yet only by the supernatural is a man strong: only by confiding in the divinity which stirs in us. Nothing is so weak as an egotist. Nothing is mightier than we, when we are vehicles of a truth, before which the State and the individual are alike ephemeral.

The development of our American internal resources, the extension to the utmost of the commercial system, and the appearance of new moral causes which are to modify the State, are giving an aspect of greatness to the Future, which the imagination fears to open. One thing is plain for all men of common sense and common science, that here, here in America, is the home of man. After all the deductions which are to be made for our pitiful and most unworthy politics, which stake every gravest national question on the silly die, whether James or whether Jonathan shall sit in the chair and hold the purse, after all the deduction is made for our frivolities and insanities, there still remains an organic simplicity and liberty, which, when it loses its balance redresses itself presently, which offers opportunity to the human mind not known in any other region.

SEATSFIELD.

The Boston Daily Advertiser, not long since, created no small stir among our literati by the following article:

THE GREATEST AMERICAN AUTHOR.

We should not attempt to offer our readers a critical analysis of our young national literature, or to name for them any one writer as a confessed leader in its ranks; but finding the question of superiority already decided in a high quarter, we cannot hesitate a moment in laying the decision before the public, and asking its assistance in investigating the remaining point of research—the question where this laurelled hero is concealed. We find the announcement to which we allude, in a German work on the history of literature, by an eminent writer and critic, published something more than a year since at Berlin, under the title of "A History of Modern Literature, by Theodore Mundt, being a continuation of Frederic Von Schlegel's History of Literature." In this book, the author, in speaking of works of fiction, after commenting in terms of high praise upon those of Cooper and Irving, goes on as follows:

"While speaking of transatlantic authors, we are desirous of mentioning one who, though he does not strictly come under this head of literature, [the authors of fiction,] may be classed under it from the subjects and tendency of his writings. This writer is SEATSFIELD, the author of 'Viry,' 'The Legitimate,' 'Sketches of Life from both Hemispheres,' and lastly, 'The Cabin Book.' This great national painter of the characteristics of his native land, has unfolded the American life and its various relations yet better than those we have just named, (Cooper and Irving.) The mystery that for a long time hung over the person of this author, and does so partially as yet, was not affected as matter of literary coquetry, or through a money-making concealment, as was the case with the incognito of the 'great unknown,' Walter Scott.

"Our author has two much simplicity and honesty for this, being a man of weight of mind rather than of showy action, to whom his subject matter is the thing of the only importance. Thus we see him in all his works overlooking the form, and engrossed in the subject alone, indifferent whether he produces a novel, a history, or a journal of travels. He shows in all an exhausting, thoughtless profusion, as imposing as his subjects are colossal. In his descriptions of American scenery, of the uncontrolled vegetation of his country, and the 'poetry of wilderness,' which he has had the power to conjure up in all its details, as well as in its boundless extent—he has reached the climax of sublimity, while he, at the same time paints with the simplest colors. Not less remarkable is his psychological stand-point, from which he is able to draw, in the characteristics he presents, the national peculiarities blended with the characteristics of man everywhere. He often gives a glimpse of the transatlantic social relations in contrast with those of his own country, and thus shows himself an acute observer of the state of things in Europe, which, in many points, he places behind the American manners in naturalness and morality. The easy and unartificial style and structure of his writings only help to give them a stronger appearance of being the direct transcript of that which he has seen and experienced."

Some of the papers thought this was a hoax on the part of the German writer, intended to ridicule the flourish of trumpets, which Americans often make about tenth-rate authors, indigenous to their own soil. But the Advertiser soon came out with the following:

We give below a letter from a correspondent, whose information may be depended upon, containing an account of the unknown American author for whom we inquired a few days since, which is confirmed by what we learn from several other sources. The books ascribed to Seatsfield, for it is not wholly beyond question that they are not the joint performances of two persons, have attracted much attention in Germany, from combining the two qualities, hardly to be expected of one author—of an extensive knowledge of American manners, relations, and scenery, and a correct and even elegant use of the German language. They are all written in German, and have none of them ever appeared in English at all, and it was therefore the result of a strange classification, that Mundt should call their author the head of *American* literature. In addition to the information contained in the following letter, we learn that Seatsfield is an American by birth, who married a German lady, and now lives in German Switzerland. The first of his works appeared in 1828.

Should we obtain, hereafter, any further account of his life, or of his works, or, as we hope to, any more light upon the "mysterious circumstances" attending them, we shall lay them before the public, and in the meantime we offer the letter to which we have alluded:

"I have just seen in the Boston Courier, an extract from the Daily Advertiser, about a 'Great Unknown,' Seatsfield by name; highly lauded by Theodore Mundt, as an American author, in his History of Literature; inquired after by the Advertiser, and considered to be a specimen of the hoax superlative, by a correspondent of the Courier. Now the name of the man I had never before known, but some of his books I read, while in Germany. That books, with the titles as cited, actually exist, there is no question; and that the books had some author, and that the author had lived long in the United States, is equally certain. German report said of him, that he had passed several years in our States, especially the southern and southwestern; and that he was then living in Switzerland. Whether he is an American by birth, I know not; but in Germany, he is considered as an American author. His several volumes had a reputation throughout Germany hardly second to that of Irving or of Cooper. They were spoken of, by literary men, and by philosophers, as superior to any descriptions of this country that had appeared. I recollect hearing a well-known German novelist, whose real name is Haering, but who is known in literature as Alexis Willibad, (and who by the way wrote a romance, long supposed, in Germany, to be by Sir Walter Scott,) express unbounded admiration of these works of the new Unknown. In short, they were known and talked about in all circles. They were even thought to be significant of a new era in American authorship. They were cited as admirable specimens of a new style of novels, combining the interest of travels with the charms of fiction.

"Theodore Mundt's History of Literature is, also, a real, extant history. I suppose it did not enter his head that such books could be unknown in the very land they were intended to depict. He may even have supposed that they were originally published in this country, and then done into German.

"The books were written in the German language, which fact will account for all that seems mysterious. I have often wondered that none of our professed translators have ever given us these books in English dress. If well done, any publisher would find it for his interest to issue them. There may now be some ten or twelve volumes of them all, small duodecimos. All classes, both in the north and south of Germany, read them with avidity; they are current books in all their circulating libraries; they have contributed not a little to the reputation of American literature in that critical land; and it is not a little amusing, it might be thought a capital subject for sarcasm against us, that all America knows nothing of them, and that some Americans consider the whole thing, books and author, to be a pleasant invention of Theodore Mundt; or a *quiz*, successfully practised upon one who knows enough about modern literature to be competent to write its history.

"The scenes of most of the volumes are laid in our southern and southwestern States; some of them, I believe, in Mexico. They give most animated, or, as the phrase goes, 'graphic' pictures of the mixed society of those parts of our land. French, Yankees, and Spaniards, Creoles, Quadroons, black and white, politicians, and blacklegs, steamboats, and stage-coaches, political disputes, and religious discussions, plantations and cities, all are described, and described to the life.

"Thus much may help to throw some light upon the question, as to the real, mythical or metaphysical existence of Mr. Seatsfield."

From the Newtown (Pa.) Journal.

SLAVE HUNTERS AGAIN IN THE FIELD.

BIG BEN CARRIED INTO SLAVERY.—During three or four days of last week, a carriage-load of slave-hunters have been prowling through the townships of Buckingham, Solebury, and Plumstead, in pursuit of fugitive slaves. Their plan of operations has been to make use of a certain *vagabond ex-justice of the peace*, as a pioneer, who has been seen in close conference with them in different places, within a few days. On sixth day morning last, the gang came very near securing one—but through the sagacity and presence of mind of his wife, they were put on another track. But in the afternoon of the same day, they were more successful. On that day, they arrived in Centreville, and were seen at different intervals talking with their *out-rider*, who appeared to direct all their movements. This man went to a place near Forestville, where a number of choppers were employed in a wood. He soon recognized Big Ben among them—made a few observations to some of the company, and left the place. In a short time the carriage came near the ground; two remained in the vehicle, and five were actively employed in the capture. One of the latter approached Ben, inquired the way to Kirk's store, who, being informed, introduced some other topics of conversation; allowing time for the rest of the company to come up, he still approaching nearer to the object of pursuit. When the favorable moment had arrived, the first speaker arrested Ben with a tap on the shoulder. The latter not suspecting the object, or from some other cause, consented to go with the man, and was about making preparations, when handcuffs and manacles for the legs were handed out, and preparations made to secure their victim. The sight of these emblems of slavery, aroused the ire of this sable Samson, who now saw his situation! But he was not intimidated. He told them that the fetters should never go on his limbs, *and he alive!* A terrible conflict now ensued. Ben drew his axe, and would have laid open the scull of his adversary, had not his arm been partially arrested. There was force enough left, however, to cut a terrible gash in his head, and to lay the assailant on the ground. All the address and force of the gang were now in requisition—for they had aroused a slumbering lion. They assailed him with clubs, and one of the company drew a pistol from his pocket, and presented it at Ben—but he had now come to a state of feeling that was *beyond flinching*—he told the man to "shoot and be damned." The conflict progressed with various success, and for a time seemed likely to give victory to Ben, although such fearful odds were against him. But the man who was most active in the arrest at first, and who has doubtless served a regular apprenticeship to this business, rallied his company, (and there was need,) for Ben had dealt his blows with such Herculean strength, that the captors found it convenient not to come too near. In this state of the battle, the chief assailant called to his companions, "For God's sake to assist." The onset was renewed, and although Ben had exhibited great strength, he dealt his blows like a blind Polyphemus. He had received many himself, on his arms, legs, head, and shoulders, which were almost lacerated with bruises. He suddenly became very sick. His hands were then secured, and the captors were about to put the manacles on his limbs, which he still resisted with giant power. The *five* men having secured their prisoner, he was driven to Kirk's store, having expressed a wish to see S. Kirk, in whose employ he had been. From this place, I am informed, he was taken to Doylestown on the same evening, and lodged in the jail. I have since heard no further particulars. This has been a bloody work! The loss of blood from the wound of which I have spoken, was such that the carriage could be tracked by the blood dripping through the bottom. Big Ben has been a good citizen. He has sustained the character of an industrious, honest man. He owned a house and lot in Buckingham, at the time of his arrest. He was well known to most of the inhabitants of this section, having resided here nearly fifteen years. More anon. HUMANITAS.

GENERAL TOM THUMB.

The American dwarf who has been figuring at our museums, under this name, is now in England. He has paid a visit to Queen Victoria, who, with the Queen of the Belgians, the Prince of Wales, and the Princess Royal, received him at Buckingham Palace. "The General" went through all his performances before these illustrious individuals, giving them his imitations of Napoleon, and his versions of the living statues, as well as dancing the smallest of all hornpipes—not omitting an American ditty here and there. Her majesty was pleased to express great delight in the labors of the little gentleman, and with her own hand presented him with a mother of pearl souvenir, elegantly set in gold, and mounted with precious stones; one side exhibiting the royal crown and her majesty's initials, and the other a group of flowers worked in enamel, and inlaid with rubies. In addition to this valuable present, her majesty also bestowed a beautiful gold pencil case, with the arms of the puissant atomy engraved thereon. The visit lasted about one hour.

Soon after the general's return to his quarters at the Egyptian hall, he was honored with a visit from the Duke of Wellington. At the moment the duke entered the room, the general was in the act of giving an imitation of Napoleon musing at St. Helena, and on the hero of Waterloo inquiring of Mr. Barnum what the general was meditating on, Mr. Barnum happily replied, "Upon the loss of the battle of Waterloo." His grace then took the dwarf into his arms, and asked him several questions, with the answers to which the duke appeared to be much pleased. On his departure, the duke presented General Thumb with a handsome present.

The general, one day, made his appearance at the stock exchange, and was universally allowed to be the smallest American stock ever known there; Pennsylvania dividends, of course, excepted.—*Punch.*

EAST INDIA COTTON.

The Post, last year, had a good deal to say about the *decrease* of the importations of East India cotton into Liverpool. It forgot then to mention the cause of this decrease. Of course this omission was wholly accidental. The Post knew, *of course*, that the secret of it all was that a market so much nearer and better in China, attracted thither a large portion of East India cotton, which would otherwise have gone to England. The Post knew all this, but was silent. Why? Because in spite of the market in China, the importations into England the present year, *are greater than ever before!*

In 1843, between January 1st and March 1st, there were imported into Great Britain 200,955 bales of American cotton. During the same period, this year, the imports amount to 170,445. Decrease 30,510—or about 15 per cent! During the same periods in the two years the import into England of East India cotton has been as follows:

1843	4,901 bales.
1844	11,131 "

Increase, 6,230, or over *a hundred and thirty per centum!* What says Mr. Post to this?—*Boston Atlas.*

CHEAP BOARDING.—The following plan is *said* to be practised out West: Serve up dried *apples* for breakfast—drink *water* for dinner—and "let 'em *swell*" for supper.

FOR HOUSEKEEPERS AND FARMERS.

Use of Charcoal as a Manure for Wheat.—Doctor Lee, in his admirable address before the agricultural society of Erie county, New-York, states it as a fact, that the liberal application of charcoal to the wheat fields of France, has added, within the last ten years, one hundred millions of bushels to the annual crop of wheat grown in that kingdom.

Musquetoes.—To get rid of these tormentors, take a few hot coals on a shovel or a chafing dish, and burn upon them some brown sugar in your bedrooms and parlors, and you effectually banish or destroy every musqueto for the night.—*Parley's Magazine.*

A Good Orchard.—Every farmer who is not in possession of a good orchard, should now set about planting one. The profit and convenience of an orchard, are almost invaluable to the farmer—good fruit will always sell if he happens to have a surplus, and a plenty of fruit takes away the appetite for intoxicating drink—this is a fact which cannot be too often repeated.

To him who has a great plenty of land, and great variety of surface, I would advise for an orchard, a valley between hills if possible, so that the wash from the land surrounding may always tend to the orchard—and the winds may be impeded, by the hills, from visiting the orchard too roughly.

There has been great diversity of opinion upon the distance of planting trees from each other—some have contended that the distance should be four rods, that the sun and air may have full influence on every tree, and every part of it—others have contended that a distance much less is better. My own experience and observation are in favor of close planting, so that by the time the trees have got to their usual size, the limbs of them shall mingle, and interlock each other, and the ground underneath will be perfectly shaded. Trees thus growing, will produce larger and finer fruit, and ground thus shaded, will not be likely to be sapped with the growth of grass or weeds, nor parched or dried by the sun.

A young orchard should always be kept under cultivation—it will make an excellent potato field for many years, provided it is well manured, and when it has become so shady that potatoes will not grow, then keep it for a summer retreat for your hogs. The hogs will keep in good health on the poor apples that fall from the trees, and the worm that calculated on a resurrection in the form of curculio, finds nought but annihilation in the jaws of the swine. Therefore, the result is, after a few years, fine fruit without wormy apples.

Although the last season was a very good one for fruit, yet there was not enough raised in our State to supply the demand, and 15,000 barrels were brought down on the Western railroad to supply the demand at Boston. We can raise as good fruit, and can afford it as low as the farmers in New-York. If our lands are not so good naturally, we can make them so artificially—and we too have railroads to trundle them off to our hearts content.

We never need fear of raising too much fine fruit,—for when such a contingency happens, by the aid of steam, we can seek a market to the islands of the ocean, or across the Atlantic, where Yankee fruit is always cheerfully and well received.—*Taunton Whig.*

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of fifteen or twenty boarding pupils. They will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife, and other teachers, and will be subject to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the association.—The name of the association indicates the idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to education, which should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year as an equivalent for instruction and board; from which a suitable deduction will be made when a pupil comes for several years. The year will commence on the 1st of May, next, and will have no fixed and entire vacation. Pupils will be received for a year at any time.

O. MACK, *Director of Education.*

BROUGHTON MEADOWS, Northampton, April 14, 1844.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress.* The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite.—*Job.* xvii. 8.

Abhor detraction, the sin of fallen angels, and the worst of fallen men.—*Wm. Penn.*

NARRATIVE of the Proceedings of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and their Subsequent Confirmation by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in the case of Isaac T. Hopper. Just published, and for sale at this office, No. 143 Nassau street, New-York; and at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 31 North Fifth street, Philadel.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortment of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail. CHARLES WISE,

Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets.

Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, North Fifth street.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months. $10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for twenty copies.

A full assortment of anti-slavery publications is kept constantly on hand. Also, a handsome variety of miscellaneous books, and useful and fancy stationery.

All letters relating to the business of the office should be directed to *J. Miller McKim*, No. 31 North Fifth st.

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

CHARLES ATKINS